

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

Editor :
Very Reverend Canon G. D. Smith, D.D., Ph.D.

The Editor is always ready to consider articles which may be of interest to the Clergy, but such articles should be typewritten, with double spacing. We also invite our readers to propose for solution cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or other departments of sacred science, and we hope that they will not hesitate to contribute to our Correspondence pages their views on the solution of such cases or on any other matter which falls within the scope of THE CLERGY REVIEW.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time to the Editor at St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware, Herts.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager,

THE CLERGY REVIEW
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

129 VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.1

Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers :

£1 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JANUARY 1941

ARTICLES

(1) The Anglican Papalists	PAGE 1
By Rev. Thomas Holland, D.D., Ph.D.	
(2) Richard Rolle—Englishman	31
By Stanley B. James	

HOMILETICS

The Sundays of February	45
By Rev. William Gordon	

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

Lessons for February	54
By Rev. Francis C. Devas, S.J.	

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

(1) Moral Theology	62
By Very Rev. Canon E. J. Mahoney, D.D.	
(2) Ascetical and Mystical Theology	68
By Rev. Laurence P. Emery	

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(1) Easter Communion in Parish Church	74
(2) Religious Profession	75
(3) Marriage Dispensation in Canon 1045 §3	77
(4) Housekeepers	79
(5) Curate and Marriage Impediment	81
(6) Burial in Non-Catholic Cemeteries	83
(7) Burial of Non-Catholics	84
(8) Sea Voyagers' Faculties	86
(9) Unlawful Baptismal Sponsor	87
By Very Rev. Canon E. J. Mahoney, D.D.	

ROMAN DOCUMENT	89
--------------------------	----

CHURCH MANAGEMENT	91
-----------------------------	----

BOOK REVIEW	93
-----------------------	----

TheCLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XX, No. 1.

JANUARY, 1941

THE ANGLICAN PAPALISTS

“IF I were asked how we wish to be designated I should say I was an Anglican : but our opponents call us Papalists, and I should accept that term and think it honourable. . . .”

The extract is from a recent letter of one of the chief sponsors in the Anglican communion of the Church Unity Octave.

There is no need for me here to deal with the history and development of that devotion, and much less is it my intention to put it in its right place in the stream of events flowing from the Oxford Movement. I do not wish even to debate whether there has, or has not, been a “wonderful revival” in the Church of England in the last hundred years.^{1*}

All this article sets out to do, and that in the barest outline, is to offer a theological consideration of the papal section here and now undeniably existing in the Anglican Body ; a consideration which, if it be eirenic in its main conclusions, is no mere gushing response to Lord Clonmore’s appeal for sympathy and understanding in this matter.² Some half-dozen years of study, a change of viewpoint, and a desire to canvass other opinions before casting the study into definite shape, are the motives behind the present writing.

The Facts. It will be useful to stick to Lord Clonmore’s date, 1891, and the fortuitous meeting of Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal, as the origin of the Papalists. True, Dr. Langford-James may claim a great part in the juridical forming of the party, as he explained in these pages some years ago.³ His projection of the scheme at London in 1910 “at a very representative meeting of Anglo-

* For references see end of article.

catholic clergymen" was apparently novel enough to be "a veritable bombshell", and found only one supporter, albeit a good one.⁴ But surely the most notable event, if one considers the currents generated, is the Abbé Portal's speech at a meeting of the English Church Union, 14 July, 1896.⁵ The time of its delivery was momentous: just after the "Satis Cognitum" and just before the Bull "Apostolicae Curae" condemning Anglican Orders; also just before Cardinal Vaughan's famous speech at Hanwell, which was a reply to the French priest and his sympathizers.⁶

I rank the Abbé's speech as important because of the effect on Halifax of his appeal. He (Portal) said, while minimizing obstacles to Reunion: "Nor, gentlemen, is the Encyclical 'Satis Cognitum' any fresh obstacle either . . . if it be studied with calmness and patience. . . . The prerogatives of the Pope are of divine right. Holy Scripture and the Consensus of the early Fathers attest it. Surely the Anglican Church cannot refuse this meeting-point to which Leo XIII invites her? . . ."⁷ Until then Halifax had adopted the phrase "*providentia divina*" in reference to the papal primacy; subsequently he changed it for "*iure divino*".⁸ The Papalist Party have followed him. At the Church Unity Octave Meeting, 1938, one speaker dealt with "The Bible and Papacy"; Fr. McNabb with "The Petrine Quality of the N.T."⁹ It is some indication of the distance travelled.

The Unity Octave may serve to give some idea of the growth and actual numbers of the Papalist Party. Dr. Langford-James mentions "a score" for 1908.¹⁰ These are the figures for the last four years: 1937-873; 1938-914; 1939-951; 1940-1,022. These statistics refer to Anglican clergy alone; the American Episcopalians muster about 300. It is interesting to note that even in 1935 some 30 Religious Communities . . . "observed it (the Octave) with great

fidelity; some not only keeping a watch of prayer constantly during the day before their altars, but continuing it also through the night watches".¹¹ Last year 40 communities participated.

The above figures do not include such as kept the Octave without official notice of the fact; they are estimated as "many hundreds".¹²

Have all the same dogmatic outlook? I quote from the same source: "Recently we have distinguished between those giving general support and those who accept fully the dogmatic position of the promoters of the C.U.O., and the proportion of the latter has been about three times the former. . . ." That means, for last year, about 770 in full dogmatic agreement.

There one has a definite minimum figure of the Papalist Party, and I should be content to leave it at that were not voices of dissent likely to break in from all sides. Even Mr. Leslie Brookes, quoting the Unity Octave figure for 1936, allowed 1,500;¹³ Dr. Langford-James doubled that, qualifying, however, with "more or less loosely".¹⁴ Bishop Hensley Henson, to go to the utmost limit, once estimated Anglo-catholic strength at one third the clergy of the Establishment; Mr. Whitton approves Fr. Woodlock's more conservative "a fifth";¹⁵ but none of the three was specifying the pro-Romans. Perhaps the only conclusion possible is the terribly vague estimate of the letter I have quoted: "I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that at least 1,000 priests—and it may be two or three times that number—would favour reunion with the Holy See on the basis of full dogmatic agreement."

What, then, are the present obstacles? Dr. Langford-James saw the whole trouble in the "Apostolicae Curac": "the really fundamental point . . . is that the judgement . . . has never won our acceptance".¹⁶ But he comes to the nerve of the matter when, while

admitting that it may have been a tactical blunder to make Anglican Orders the first question for settlement, he says : "but otherwise they [Halifax and Portal] were surely right, for it involved the whole question of our ecclesiastical position as an organized body".¹⁷

This preoccupation with the ecclesiastical Ego of the Church of England appears even in the most Romeward section of the Centenary Manifesto :¹⁸ "We affirm that the claim of the Church of England to continuity with the Church of St. Augustine . . . involves oneness of Faith and Practice with the historic Church of the past, which was in unquestioned communion with the whole Catholic Church and which held the common Faith of Christendom. . . ."¹⁹

This confidence in the essential soundness of the Establishment as part of the Church of Christ finds its clear utterance in the following formulae :

"Visible communion with Rome is of the *bene esse* of the Church, not the *esse*."²⁰

" . . . the schism between Canterbury and Rome is a schism *within* the Church and not *from* the Church."²¹

The logical conclusion is clearly : "Our schism from Rome was corporate : the remedy must be corporate. Individual secession serves but to postpone reunion and leaves the problem where it was before."²²

If, then, we agree with an acute observer²³ that the only points at which the Papalists differ from Catholic doctrine are : (a) the authority of Leo XIII's condemnation of Anglican Orders ; (b) the possibility of Reunion by disciplinary adjustments ; it will be clear that a further analysis should look for the root of these surface differences.

Opinions. Lord Halifax quotes a Catholic Bishop who saluted Tractarianism as the beginning of new diabolical tactics against the Church ; all the more fearsome because of their subtlety.²⁴ It might have been fairer to have coupled with the quotation that of

the Anglican clergyman who said : "I should be sorry to trust the author of that Tract [Newman's famous No. 90] with my purse !" ;²⁵ for it is an interesting fact, and one to which Halifax was curiously blind, that however diversely individual Catholics have reacted to the Movement, each reaction has a far more emphatic counterpart within the Establishment.²⁶

If, then, one allows the Bishop to represent the extreme negative view (which has never lacked supporters), the Abbé Portal balances for the extreme positives ; nor does he lack supporters. I purposely leave aside the Malines Conferences. One who bears a name beloved by Newman is the most outspoken of the present-day positives.²⁷ He considers three possible explanations of the Anglo-catholic movement ; two—purely natural and diabolic agency—he at once rejects, and so goes on to conclude ". . . the whole Anglo-Catholic movement has been due from the beginning to an extraordinary outflow of Divine Grace, the purpose of which is to make use of the Church of England as an instrument for bringing back our countrymen in large numbers to the unity of the Faith."²⁸

Cardinal Vaughan, who is regarded in consequence as an arch "negativist" by the other side, spoke of "corporate reunion" as : "a dream and snare of the Evil One".²⁹ In this he largely re-echoes Cardinal Manning³⁰, and a pertinent warning of Cardinal Wiseman.³¹

The Abbé Portal urged the claims of "corporate" as against "individual" submission : (a) on grounds of necessity (if England is ever to be converted) ; (b) on psychological grounds (the sparing to individuals of a dangerous uprooting of convictions) ; (c) on ecclesiastical grounds (the greatness of the English Church and Rome's need of invigoration by non-Latin races).³² Practically the same grounds are adopted today, even to the race idea. But the purpose

is rather to commend the need on our part of developing a "new approach" rather than to compare the merits of different kinds of reunion for their own sakes.

The Point at Issue : The "new approach" serves to focus the matter for the practical priest. He is aware that England is not being catholicized on anything like the scale she was (and continues to be) de-catholicized ; but isn't that due to the nature of the case, or at least of the times ? Not at all, say the Catholic "positives" ; it is due to our failure to take hold of an instrument here and now presented to us. The Holy Spirit (they would say) has clearly, for the past hundred years, taught large sections of the Establishment the notes of the Church in reverse order ; at last the note of Unity dawns on them ; the proof is the Papalist movement ; the hour, therefore, is critical ; and yet (they conclude) we present the same attitude of suspicion and resistance which Wiseman had to deplore a century ago.³³

But, even so (reasons the average man), isn't there danger in conceiving the Holy Spirit as "working *in and through*" the Church of England ?³⁴ If you look at the thing as a whole, the reality seems to be quite other ; but even sticking to the narrower phenomenon of Anglo-catholicism, if Wiseman himself had eventually to express misgivings,³⁵ Manning and Newman to withdraw behind clear defence-lines³⁶—a position which their successors have not seen fit to relinquish—surely there must be a measure of obscurity in the theology of "new approaches" ; and, in the practical order, why do so many converts themselves advocate the cudgel as ultimately more charitable than the hand-clasp ?

I have no competence in the pastoral matter ; perhaps, also, the whole speculative field lies within the "opinabilia". No other attempt will, therefore, be made here than to offer a *possible* solution ; and the question stands thus : "*How may one justify and*

formulate, within the limits of Catholic theology, a constructive view of the relations of the Holy Ghost to the Anglican Papalist movement?"

Preliminary Observations : (i) The question is not proposed under the dichotomy : "Is it the work of the Holy Ghost or of the Devil (*sub forma angeli lucis*)?" Extorting simple answers about complex phenomena always smacks of sophistry, apart from the fruitless antagonism which would arise in the present case. (ii) The solution is only claimed to be "possible" in the sense that it does not conflict with any principle of Catholic theology to issue a passport (in the terms to be formulated) to the A-P movement *as it is here understood*. Now, that understanding, though of course it is considered warrantable, is not offered as the only one possible ; hence a note of hypothesis rather than fact. (iii) "The A-P movement" implies some kind of collectivity, however loosely federated ; one is not therefore dealing with individuals as such. The Papalists insist they are "in and of the Establishment".³⁷ (iv) The Holy Ghost : i.e. in His "temporal mission" is the vivifying principle of the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church. Here we are on common ground : nor need the point of the Anglican agreement be laboured. The whole insistence of the Oxford Movement on its place in the one true Church of Christ, and the various attempts to body forth a conception of that Church in which there shall be room for "Ecclesia Anglicana", are so many proofs that they have appreciated the central truth that the One Spirit has one body and one organic operation.

The Theory. Here the treatment must be sketchy and technical ; otherwise the thing could not be seen as a whole within the limits of this article.

A. *Principles :* (i) There is only one "instrumentum coniunctum" of the Holy Spirit's action, viz. the Church of Christ ; there can be many "instrumenta separata", v.g. the Greek Church even for valid con-

fessions, a Jew administering baptism, etc. These are used : (a) always "in bonum fidelium" who are otherwise unattainable by the Church ; (b) only in so far as there is some conjunction—at least "intentional"—with the true Church.

(ii) Since the true Church is one and undivided,³⁸ such use of "separated instruments", achieved in virtue of their *de facto* conjunction with the true Church, must be carefully distinguished from the organic workings of the Holy Spirit within the Church. Failure to make this distinction in the speculative order cannot but have dire consequences in the practical order.³⁹ Things should be judged by what they are or do *per se* and not *per accidens*. (*Summa Theologica*, I, q. xix, art. 9, ad. 1.) "Separated instruments" serve to carry the salvific action only in virtue of their conjunction with the Church ; that conjunction (*ex hypothesi*) is "accidental *de facto*".⁴⁰ It would be ministering to confusion, therefore, to speak of the action of the Holy Ghost "in and through" a separated instrument, without at the same time indicating the conjunction with the Church, by which instrumentality becomes possible. It would always be unsound to speak simply of "the organic action of the Holy Ghost" outside the Church.

(iii) The organic action of the Holy Ghost within the Church must again be distinguished from His indwelling of individuals by grace. This latter is not co-terminous with the visible Church, but it does imply membership therein, at least "in voto implicito". Juridical incorporation (by baptism *in re*) may or may not be present.

(iv) The organic action within the Church must also be distinguished from (what one may call) the "assimilative" action of the Holy Ghost upon subjects outside the Church. "Omnis gratia Spiritus S. tendit ad unionem Corporis Mystici". Now it is possible to be within the Mystical Body and yet not

visibly a member of the Church ; nor dare we set limits to the actual realization of this possibility.⁴¹ But, however frequent, this always remains outside the normal plan of salvation as revealed to us. The visible Church is the Mystical Body (though, of course, not precisely *qua* visible), and there alone are the constituted means of "life in Christ issuing into life eternal". It is right, therefore, to say that the full term of the "assimilative action" of the Holy Ghost is union with Christ in the visible unity of the Church.

(v) It is necessary (if we are ever to get rid of a radical misunderstanding) to distinguish in the "assimilative action" the production of the two states : (a) being indwelt by the Holy Spirit by sanctifying grace ; (b) being under the organic action of the Holy Spirit in the visible union of the Church (cf. (iii)). They may be produced simultaneously, or either one before the other ; they are never produced without reference to each other. As the present study deals only with the approach to the Church, that is what is meant by "assimilative action" here.

(vi) The process of assimilation may be : (a) violent and sudden (St. Paul) or long and gradual (Newman) ; (b) solitary or in company (family, community, church) ; in other words, with—or without—the aid of a social tie. In all cases, however, the process is chiefly positive—not negative, i.e. consists in perfecting what is already possessed rather than in uprooting what is wrong.⁴²

(vii) The general truths of divine causality and providence apply here and are pre-supposed. Suffice it to have pointed out two of the more immediate ones : (a) *Deus est provisor universalis* ;⁴³ (b) God directly intends what is of its nature good ; permits *malum per accidens* ; permits *malum per se*—for a good purpose.⁴⁴

(viii) One special principle from the Grace tract needs mentioning : the Holy Ghost cannot give grace

for an erroneous act of faith, in so far as the act is elicited by the intellect, yet the pressure of the will under which the intellect acts can be due to the motion of divine grace.⁴⁵

B. *Analysis*: (i) Papalism is a special movement within the High Church party of the Establishment; and it is supremely important to determine what is the essential element common to the two before going on to discuss the specific element of the Papalists. The matter does not lend itself readily to scientific research, but after due allowance for the vagaries of individual opinion it can safely be said that the generic part of the A-P outlook is the belief that the Church of England—along with the Roman and Eastern Communion—is part of the true Church of Christ, which is His Mystical Body.⁴⁶ The specific element is direct approach to Roman communion.

(ii) This element involves the following tendencies, of which the first and second only are peculiarly proper, the others being found separately elsewhere along with widely diverging outlook.

(a) Tendency towards greater subjection to the Holy See.

(b) Return to full dogmatic outlook of the Church.

(c) Return to sacraments, sacramentals, liturgy, etc.

(d) Return to traditional asceticism, vows, religious life, etc.

(iii) A moral analysis of these tendencies imposes the following decisions:

(a) Of itself good; hard to see how circumstances could make it otherwise; wholly sound in its effects.

(b) Of itself good; liable, however, to be occasion of evil, in so far as Papalists see less need for abandoning their communion; *per accidens* evil, therefore; important as opening up intellect to divine grace.

(c) In the doctrinal order, to be judged as (b).

In the practical order, a simple judgement is not possible; it becomes necessary to adopt two different

standpoints, and that means a successive reversing of the verdict. (i) Objectively considered (adoration of bread, fictitious absolutions, etc., etc.), the thing of itself is an evil; accidentally, because of the individual's good faith, there is good in it. (ii) Viewed subjectively (adoration of the Holy Eucharist, imparting of Christ's pardon, etc), the thing of itself is good; accidentally—because in this objective case the right powers are not employed—disorder (evil, therefore) is produced; again, further disorder may arise from the resultant conviction of the individual that there is no need to approach the Roman Church for what he himself already possesses: *per accidens* evil.

(d) Of itself good. *Per accidens*, evil, for the same reason as (c), viz. consolidating Papalists in *statu quo*.

(iv) The common element, viz. belief that the Church of England is a true part of the Church of Christ, is, of course, dogmatic error whose sting is only neutralized by individual and group good-faith. A word on that later. For the present, it must be recognized that this error is (*salvo meliori iudicio*) at the "terminus a quo" of the A-P movement, a point of departure shared by all High Church movements. The objective truth of the matter is that there is essential conflict between the common and the specific elements of the A-P outlook. Newman's dilemma hits off this fact: "Either the movement is not from God, or the Establishment is not: we must abjure our principles, or abandon our communion."⁴⁷ The subjective view of the Anglicans is that the movement stands or falls by the possibility of Corporate Reunion;⁴⁸ they insist that rather than a party they are a movement—therefore not yet *in termino*;⁴⁹ they reiterate that the *terminus ad quem* is "the healing of the deplorable schism"⁵⁰—"that Reunion with Rome is the logical and highest goal and the natural consummation of the movement".⁵¹

(v) Corporate Reunion becomes, therefore, the

crux of the analysis. Cursed by the "negatives", commended by the "positives", summarily dismissed by Manning⁵² only to reappear fantastically at Malines,⁵³ Corporate Reunion is the characteristic joint-product of the common and specific elements of Papalism. It is impossible here to make all the analysis necessary before the question can be adequately solved, but the distinction must at least be made between Corporate Reunion : (a) strictly so called, i.e. under the hierarchy of the separated church,⁵⁴ which can be complete or partial ; (b) less strictly, i.e. where the reunion is achieved (completely or in part) under religious leaders, who, whatever their standing, cannot be properly regarded as a hierarchy ; this can be equated with mass-conversion and can occur in a church, a parish, or a community.⁵⁵ Here the late Fr. Keating's anxiety to have the status of the Anglican Church recognized for what it is⁵⁶ really has application ; their lack of a valid hierarchy does indeed make the first kind of Corporate Reunion impossible ; and that, unfortunately, is the kind of reunion of which the A-Ps are alone thinking at present.⁵⁷ Yet it is not the only kind of Corporate reunion which should be discussed. The following letter seems important enough to be quoted in extenso :

"Et tout d'abord, permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il n'est pas exact qu'à Rome on se borne à désirer des conversions individuelles ne voulant pas l'union en corps : il est vrai seulement qu'on ne veut pas d'entraves aux conversions individuelles, dont le succès est plus proche et plus facile, tandis que l'on s'occupe de l'union en corps."⁵⁸

C. *Conclusions* : I. The specific element of the A-P movement may be a *per se* effect of the assimilative action of the Holy Spirit who *permits* the common element to subsist for a good purpose, which possibly is a wide-scale return of separated Christians to the visible unity of the Mystical Body.

II. However wide the scale of this return, its scope cannot be Corporate Reunion in the strict sense ; and that, not merely for the lack of a valid hierarchy, but rather for the lack of any principle of dogmatic authority ;⁵⁹ which further makes highly unlikely any mass-return even remotely commensurate with the total membership of the Establishment.

III. The principal agent of the limited mass-return could only be the Holy Ghost Himself, and His "conjoint instrument" only the true visible Church. His active and immediate "separate instrument" of assimilation could be the A-P movement ; but then, if the movement be viewed as "in and of the Establishment", only accidentally and *de facto*. The instrumentality of the Establishment itself : (a) in the production of the movement, appears to be proximate, but more passive or occasional than active ; (b) in the further process of assimilation, remote and passive.

IV. A theological description of the whole phenomenon might run : "An instance of the 'assimilative action' of the Holy Ghost (outside the sphere of His organic influence) taking advantage of : (a) the special dogmatic receptivity of a separated church ; (b) a fund of Catholic truths jointly upheld by a number of members in common invincible ignorance of the visible Church ; to initiate a progress socially towards the centre of unity ; which (more or less) organized progress may itself serve as the immediate 'separated instrument' of the assimilative process, thereby so widened as to encompass the mass-return (upon a limited scale) of separated Christians to the visible unity of the Church."

.

I think the conclusions fairly documented in the previous sections ; but it will make for completeness if, by means of a slight commentary, the position is elucidated in its major points.

D. *Elucidation*: I. The first conclusion is "positive", but the extent of the terms should be noted. No brief is there held for the subjective views of the men actually in the movement, at least as regards the conditions of its fulfilment. They hold that the end of the movement is visible reunion with the Head of the Church; they hold, further, that this reunion shall be of a certain nature, and on certain conditions. Here, I believe, is the root of the "ayes" and "noes" among Catholics. If you judge the preponderant element in the A-P movement to derive from the view as to the nature and conditions of reunion, your verdict on its relations to the Holy Ghost will be substantially negative: you will be bound to see the whole thing as an illusion merely permitted by the Holy Ghost, which He may make the occasion of benefit in ways beyond our guessing. If, however, you analyse the recognition of the need for Catholic reunion as the paramount principle (as does this article), then it becomes possible to see the movement as directly promoted by the Holy Ghost, and the natural term would be to bring a number of individuals unitedly into the Church.

It remains necessary to give some explanation which will justify the possibility (I do not say the necessity) of such a constructive analysis, and co-ordinate the foregoing principles on which it is based.

If tendency towards greater subjection to the Holy See be *per se bonum* (Analysis (iii), (a)), and if again the process of assimilation directly promoted by the Holy Ghost be realizable with the help of a social bond outside that of the true Church (Principles (vi), (b)), and again be gradual and positive (*ibid.*), it seems that nothing in Catholic theology can exclude the possibility of the Holy Ghost granting an illustration of intellects and a motion of wills simultaneously to a number of men bound in the common invincible ignorance of certain articles of faith, though possessing

implicit belief in all : an illustration of minds and a motion of wills partially effective in the order of execution, wholly so in the order of intention ; the intention being to find full union with the Head of the Church—the execution being various proposals marred by the common error which has not yet come under the new illustration. In such a case mistaken policies do not subtract the movement from the influence of the Holy Ghost. The mistake as such is not traceable to His assimilative action, but to His allowing a more radical error to persist, as yet undiminished in its sway over the mind ; but the energy of will behind the mistaken policies, as also the vision of the Church united under one head which nourishes that energy, can come uninterruptedly from the direct action of the Holy Ghost ; and it is precisely in that vision and that energy that the movement continues. This is to make two assumptions : (a) that a root heresy can persist uninfluenced by a special illustration of the Holy Ghost ; (b) that supernatural grace can energize mistaken policy. The latter is vouched for above (Principles (viii)) and cannot be gone into further here. The persistence of uninfluenced heresy, even when the mind is under the special enlightenment of the Holy Ghost, makes no greater demand than the compatibility of material sin with the state of grace. Objectively, of course, the erroneous assent and its reproduction along various lines of policy are evils ; but, as appears from the moral analysis (Analysis (iii)), they do not stifle all right direction of mind and will in the present instance. And that is enough. Were there no longer *per se bonum* in the movement it would be impossible to regard the Holy Ghost as *directly promoting it* ; at most He would be permitting it ; but given the presence of *per se bonum*, and that even in the practical order (Analysis (iii), (c)), there is still room for a constructive verdict.

Why has the first conclusion so confidently assigned the mass-attraction of separated Christians, etc., as the purpose of the Holy Ghost's action in the A-P movement? Here the previous section of Principles (*vii*) dealing with causality and providence comes into play. Even in the most favourable analysis of the A-P movement one is bound to discover evil (*per se* and *per accidens*). An easy way out is to blame it all on the spiritual shortcomings of members, on the principle that the Holy Spirit withholds further grace, where what He has already given is inadequately employed. But, I hold, such a solution is neither imperative nor profitable; at best it serves only to thrust the difficulty one stage deeper—the difficulty of explaining why the Holy Ghost permits the initial evil of neglecting grace which sanctions its further denial. The only satisfactory explanation in face of the problem of evil in all its forms is St. Thomas's principle of "provisor universalis".⁶⁰ So, in the present case, to be concrete, one might say that were the Holy Ghost simply the promoter of the spiritual welfare of Dr. Pusey, Lord Halifax, or Bishop Weston, it is difficult to see how the grace of visible membership in the Church could have been withheld from them; but the difficulty vanishes when one sees the whole range of supernatural providence in His care. One looks then for the "*maius bonum*" in the order of the whole.

But is the "*maius bonum*" subject to scientific research?⁶¹ Any form of categorical solution or aprioristic reasoning seems out of the question; but since the present answer goes no further than hypothesis it will be enough to indicate below⁶² its basis in authority and fact.

II. The second conclusion defines the limits of this attraction of separated Christians *en masse*. It is negative in so far as it excludes entirely "corporate reunion" in the strict sense; negative too in that it

looks for no really representative movement of Anglicans ; but the underlying contention is decidedly positive. "Corporate reunion" has not only suspended the movement itself and driven it into strange places ; it has developed reactions in Catholic opinion equally unfortunate. For either of those reasons the phrase should have been abandoned long ago. Lord Clonmore is right in his assertion that it is "cruel" on our part to hold out chances of "corporate reunion" to the Papalists, but the cruelty is not merely towards the Anglicans. It hurts us also, in that it destroys that delicate balance which alone makes us capable of co-operating with "a divine grace . . . poured out over England for which we cannot be too deeply thankful". That last phrase illustrates the point. Cardinal Vaughan employed it of the "ritualists" and their movement in a speech of great sympathy.⁶³ The Abbé Portal appeared and thundered his gun for "corporate reunion" . . . "without forming any judgement as to the duties which might be binding on individuals . . ."⁶⁴ The change in Vaughan was complete, and his ensuing "arch-negativism" has had wide results.⁶⁵

Now, this has happened on other occasions, and the effect has been to divide our ranks into such as are thought to be daring and unsafe, and such as view the Papalists with deep suspicion ; and the whole misfortune (and misfortune it is, in the view of this article) is rooted in failure to distinguish two senses of "corporate reunion".

Leo XIII, in his Apostolic Letter to the English People, writing of "ministers of religion in their respective communities", says :

"And we ourselves in every lawful way shall continue to promote their reconciliation with the Church, in which individuals and masses, as we ardently desire, may find so much for their imitation."⁶⁶

Cardinal Rampolla's letter, quoted above (p. 12), makes it plain that the only kind of "corporate reunion" viewed unfavourably at Rome was that which put obstacles in the way of individual conversion.

Now, so far as I can see, though "corporate reunion" in the strict sense falls necessarily within the ban, the other kind of "corporate reunion" (better called "social reunion"—or by any other name) need not do so ; and the point is important practically. For if the present contention is not astray, then the more or less of social organization already achieved, and yearly increasing, in the A-P movement, is the work of the Holy Ghost, and for no idle purpose. To approach its members, therefore, merely as individuals, disregarding the common cause they have upheld not merely as individuals but in social union, is spendthrift and obstructionist. That is not to say that we are bound to go to the other extreme and welcome them as the accredited agents of "corporate reunion" in the strict sense. That was largely the mistake of Malines ; and it is an error by excess as surely as the other approach is one by defect ; and it is the product of the same root : the failure to distinguish two senses of "corporate reunion".

That the Papalists themselves should be as yet incapable of this distinction does not exonerate ourselves ; nor should it drive us into suspicions as to the origin of the movement. The movement and the mistakes of the movement (it is becoming, I fear, a repetition *ad nauseam*) are not the same thing. All movement being a gradual relinquishing of potency, it is not to be wondered at that judgements demanding a certain degree of clarity should be impossible at certain stages of an intellectual movement. Now, to abandon the notion of "corporate reunion" in the strict sense implies an abandoning of the general High-Church position as to the status of the Establish-

ment ; implies, that is to say, the eradication of the common element underlying Anglican Papalism, which has not yet been eradicated.

III. The third conclusion makes some attempt at technical analysis of the factors present in this particular case of "assimilative action". Nobody will quarrel with the first part, viz. the principal agency of the Holy Spirit and the unique "conjoint" instrumentality of the Church. I have not insisted here on the parallel between the sacred humanity of Our Lord in the effecting of redemption and His mystical humanity, His Church, in its application ;⁶⁷ but I take it that the truth has not half unfolded its riches until it be seen that, even for those who are visibly separated from her, the Church is the channel of all grace, albeit not through her visible ordinances.

It is, again, unlikely that any view of the rôle of the Establishment be forthcoming from our side, more generous than the view put forward in this conclusion. The Papalists, of course, at their present stage of illumination, cannot do other than reject it ; but though perhaps in direct contact with them it is more psychological (and therefore theological) to unfold the positive nature of the Papacy rather than the defects of the Church of England, no purpose can be served here by cloaking the facts, and they tell very strongly against the Establishment. Pusey could entitle his *Eirenicon* : "The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity,"⁶⁸ and conclude the work with ". . . a glowing picture of the dangers through which the Church of England has kept the Faith, of her present vigorous life, and of the manifold proofs of the organic workings of God the Holy Ghost in her";⁶⁹ but much has happened since in the Anglican Church, and I fear the learned doctor would find the going hard with Anglicanism in transition !

Leaving all else aside but the claim that the

Anglican Church is a "means of establishing visible unity", I think that, although it is true that Lambeth has thrice asserted that there can be no ultimate reunion without Rome, the official attitude came through very clearly in the crucial instance of Malines and was strongly "un-instrumental" towards unity.⁷⁰

However, the main contention centres upon the instrumentality of the A-P movement, which I have called "immediate and separate" (p. 13, III) ; and here, it seems, an important distinction must be made. As an *effect*, the A-P movement can be the *direct* product of the Holy Ghost ; it cannot be His direct instrument.

There is no room here to do much else than sketch the reason of this disparity : a movement is specified by its *terminus ad quem*—by something, therefore, at present not part of its perfection ; an instrument, like every other cause, acts in virtue of its present perfection (proper or received). It is impossible therefore to lift the A-P movement out of the class of separate instruments, whose efficacy is due to their *de facto* conjunction with the true Church, even while admitting that the movement itself is a *per se* effect of the Holy Ghost. The essential difference, therefore, between the Establishment and the A-P movement as instruments is not that the one is accidentally, the other of its very nature, the instrument of the Holy Spirit ; both are no more than accidental instruments ; but the one serves a supernatural purpose in so far as it puts no obstacle in the way of a certain movement ; the movement itself serves the same purpose by positive co-operation ; and that is what is meant in Conclusion III by "immediate" and "remote and passive".

Principle (i) (p. 7) laid down two characteristics of the employment of "separate instruments" : their benefiting those who are outside the organic action of

the Church (although they invisibly belong to her) and their necessary conjunction (at least of right intention) with the Church.

A group-reunion of Anglicans in greater or less strength would adequately embody the first characteristic, and, even short of that, it is not hard to see how actual benefits accrue to men of good faith within the Anglican communion from the presence there of the Papalist movement.

One has to distinguish two groups of men in good faith: those whose personal culture, given divine grace, is sufficient for discerning the true Church of Christ among her rivals, and those who, while not entirely incapable of that,⁷¹ lack initial instruction on the observable signs of the true Church.⁷²

The leaders of the A-P movement must certainly be in the first class, and their lay followers largely in the second.⁷³ Now, it would seem that in a separated church where the principle of dogmatic authority has prevailed, the period during which the Holy Spirit works upon the leaders to bring them to see the need for immediate reunion might be shortened by any length without detriment to their people, who would do no more than their known duty in passing with their prelates into the unity of the Church. Where there is no such principle of obedience in faith, to shorten the "catechumenate" of the leaders of a reunion movement would be (*humanum dico*) disastrous for the simple people so far as their union with the visible Church is concerned; and, further, if the peculiar nature of the "catechumenate" of the leaders conducted them, however circuitously, along the precise path of recognition that the Church must have a supreme dogmatic authority and none other than the Papacy, to interrupt the period in which such a truth were being inculcated within the separated communion would be to bereave "simple" minds of just that schooling which they need to make "group-

reunion" possible—schooling in the demands of religious obedience.

To offer that as some explanation of the delay in the A-P instance is not to make the alarming mistake of supposing that the leaders have "a positive admonition or inspiration to persevere in such a state".⁷⁴

The second characteristic of "separated instruments"—their efficacy in virtue of an actual conjunction with the Church—needs little emphasis here, and is perhaps of little value as a criterion. An atheist baptizes validly, simply (in the last analysis) on condition that he wishes to be the instrument of the Church. One who teaches Catholic truths, however piecemeal and fragmentarily, cannot help being to that extent an instrument of the Church. Such contacts in no way demand special assimilative action of the Holy Spirit ; it may be helpful, however, in certain instances to allow His special "conservative" action.⁷⁵ To arrive gradually at the stage of teaching the truth of the Papal Supremacy where it was flouted *does* (it would seem) demand the special assimilative action of the Holy Ghost ; though, I repeat, that is *per se* for the *production* of so striking an effect ; its use as an instrument remains, if one reviews the whole scheme of revealed providence, accidental and *de facto*.

IV. The fourth conclusion reintroduces the matter of invincible ignorance and good faith ; and, I fear, there may not be lacking men of patristic reading to point out that the fundamental assumption of the present theory is against the traditional approach of the Church to heretics. Perhaps it is that the Fathers were, in the main, dealing with the initial stages of the heresies they combated so forthrightly, and that the theologians of the Reformation period who reaffirmed their policy were pretty much in the same case ; anyway, St. Augustine (one of the

hardest hitters) could make very generous allowances for the children of heretics, and in the present case of "inherited heresy" there is an even more authoritative lead in the same direction.

" . . . We do not wish to conceal from you that we were saddened by the thought that this our decision [*Apostolicae Curae* decree on nullity of Anglican orders] would be badly received by many, who, thinking as they do differently from us, in good faith, could not easily be brought to accept the truth. For prejudiced opinions, one-sided studies, the training of the mind from childhood, and lastly the very love of the institutions of one's country, which seem to receive added dignity from the greatness of the race itself, exercise a very great influence upon men's minds. . . . We indeed allow that those who are separated from Catholic unity, and have been imbued with other doctrines from their youth up, may be sincere and in good faith, so long as the truth is not suitably or sufficiently set before them. . . . "76

Even in Spain's superb century of faith, Suarez and the Salmanticenses⁷⁷ found it feasible for heretics and infidels to live without any influence from the Christian atmosphere surrounding them, so as to be in no doubt as to the truth of their own religious profession.

If such principles had been more in mind (and if our press were balanced enough to represent some of the fact of what we *don't* do), certain views of the influence of the Faith upon the lives of our countrymen, especially its clergymen, would never have been possible ; nor would Fr. Vernon Johnson's⁷⁸ frank avowals have been quite the shock they were to some of us.

The basic assumption of this article, then, is that Anglican Papalism is in entire good faith. It is clear that otherwise the movement could not be a direct effect of the assimilative action of the Holy Ghost, who

does not give special illuminations and energizings of will (in virtue of which, it is here maintained, the movement may exist) where evident duty is systematically abandoned.

The article set out to give no more than a possible constructive theory of Anglican Papalism. The resolution of the pastoral problem of the "new approach" was declared to be *ultra vires*.

But, since a speculative position can very often only be rightly appraised by its consequences in the practical order (though I am far from believing that to be the case here), it is due to those who have come thus far to set out under main heads the lines of policy dictated by the present theory.

E. *Practical Consequences* : I. Since this analysis sees the specific element (direct approach to Roman unity) as the *per se* effect of the assimilative action of the Holy Spirit, our closest co-operation will be to stimulate that direct approach ; e.g. articles, books, pamphlets, conferences, etc. showing unpolemically the nature of the Papacy—especially such as bring out the mystical nature of the Church and the relations between the Pope, the bishops and the faithful.⁷⁹

II. The Holy Ghost *permits* the common element (general High Church position that Church of England is part of Church of Christ) ; it does not follow that we also should "permit" it to remain undisturbed (He may be waiting for our instrumental agency to disturb it) ; but it does follow that we should do nothing to *promote* the common element. Therefore any approach along the lines of : "recognizing the greatness of the Anglican communion", "acknowledging the manifest workings of God's Spirit in AND THROUGH her institutions, ordinances, etc., etc.," "seeing the *organic* action of the Holy Spirit in the production of 'pietas Anglicana', etc."—is intolerable.

III. Though it does not follow, from the fact that the Holy Ghost permits the common element, that we should be His accomplices in that permission, it does seem to follow, from the fact that movement is positive and gradual, that we should renounce any form of approach which stresses the *wrongness* of the Anglican position. That is why in the first conclusion "unpolemic" propaganda was desiderated. The same policy seems demanded by the analysis of the essential conflict between the specific and common elements of Anglican Papalism. The more the specific element is developed, the more, objectively—though perhaps not yet subjectively—the common element is crushed ; and far more effectively than by *our* direct assault upon it, as anyone will admit who reflects upon the different value of conclusions formed out of one's own pre-digested principles and those thrust upon one by other peoples' premises.

IV. Since it has been argued that "corporate reunion" in the strict sense is impossible, whereas "group", or "social reunion" of a section of Anglicanism is possible, we should never, either domestically or in dealings with the Papalists themselves, leave our position or our terminology in doubt. To speak of "corporate reunion" simply conflicts with Conclusion II : it *does* promote the common element of Anglican Papalism. To renounce, however, all forms of reunion (or conversion, submission, etc.) except the strictly individual, conflicts with the next canon.

V. Since, it is contended, the movement as a *social* entity is the work of the Holy Spirit (and there largely is the specialty of the view), it follows that one obstructs the assimilative action in refusing to approach the Papalists as other than so many individuals. "God does nothing in vain", and however tenuous may be the bond of union among the Papalists (other than the common bond of Anglican communion), it should be treasured and promoted by

us. Meetings, therefore, at which we can address Papalists as a socially united body ; congratulations, questions, observations, etc., addressed to them officially (v.g. to the promoters of the Church Unity Octave), seem to be in the right direction. There would be nothing astray in our expressing hopes for "group-reunion", working for that, and above all praying for that ; rather we should be imitating a very sound precedent.⁸⁰

VI. Since it has been stressed that the (possible) instrumentality of the A-P movement is in all hypotheses accidental and *de facto*, it can never be our duty to set aside in favour of that what we know by revelation to be the *per se* providence of God for all, viz. their obligation of entering the Church. It follows, therefore, that the previous canon is not of unlimited exercise, but works only beyond the sphere of definite Catholic duty. I quote Wiseman, to make the point clear. He had to caution against illusions in this matter more than once.⁸¹

" . . . it is only expressing what we know to be their [Oxford tractarians'] actual views, viz. that Providence has indicated a certain extraordinary and irregular, or perhaps rather abnormal, mode of acting, which they must follow in preference to the ordinary ways and rules. . . . Feeling that they advance in grace (as they hope) and that their efforts for unity are crowned, as far as they go, with success, they see in all this an intimation from Divine Providence not to move. Now, while one may respect their feelings, and hope that God will overrule them to His own good purpose, no Catholic can for a moment allow himself to act upon them. The Catholic has the laws and commands of God and His Church for his rule ; none other. *Were a Catholic who had the opportunity of bringing anyone into unity, to neglect it, on the ground that Providence seemed to work by exceptions in the present state of things here, he would certainly sin ; for he*

would be violating a clear and positive duty, in favour of his private judgement and views regarding which he had no authority from revelation or tradition. . . . Our duty is clearly to bring everyone singly or with others, as his case comes before us, into the bosom of the Church. . . ."82

To conclude—I have offered nothing more than a possible, constructive view of Anglican Papalism ; I do not say it is imperative ; I do not say that it opens up any important new avenues such as would satisfy "positive" Catholics. But any novelty of view or practice involved must be understood entirely within the context and conditions of a Catholic's duty, so luminously expressed by the Cardinal of the Oxford converts.

One last duty remains. It was a great stumbling-block to Halifax that we never accomplished it.⁸³ Any "new approach" might include it as fundamental, and so move some way towards the fulfilment of Wiseman's sanguine vision :

"Here is the ground in which one day the two Churches will meet and join hands. In the conviction of one common fault we shall forgive one another. We have all sinned, the Church alone is free from stain."⁸⁴

THOMAS HOLLAND.

¹ For a vigorous denial by Canon Arenzden, cf. *Cath. Gazette*, XXVIII, 3 (March 1937), p. 87.

² *CLERGY REVIEW*, XVI (1939), pp. 471-484.

³ *CLERGY REVIEW*, XII (1936), pp. 506-508.

⁴ Fr. R. Knox.

⁵ Full text Lord Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, pp. 332 sqq. London (Longmans), 1912.

⁶ Sneed-Cox, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, II, p. 228. London (Herbert & Daniel), 1910.

⁷ *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (loc. cit.).

⁸ Woodlock (F.), *The Church of England and Reunion*, p. 18. London (C.T.S.), 1931.

⁹ *Tablet*, vol. 171, p. 137.

¹⁰ *CLERGY REVIEW* (loc. cit.).

¹¹ *The Lamp*, XXXIII, 12, p. 360.

¹² Private letter from Promoters C.U.O., 28 March, 1940.

¹³ *Psychological Conflict of "Roman" Anglican*. (*CLERGY REVIEW*, XII, 5, Nov. 1936, pp. 382-387.)

¹⁴ Loc. cit.

¹⁸ *Necessity for Catholic Reunion*, p. 124. London (Williams & Norgate), 1933.

¹⁹ and ¹⁷ Loc. cit.

²⁰ First appeared 1 October, 1932, with 51 signatures; February 1933 with 350 more; text in *Bulletin of Confraternity of Union*, 22 February, 1933 (Baxter Press, Oxford).

²¹ Paragraph 5.

²² Lord Halifax, op. cit. p. 406.

²³ Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clynton, *Anglican Centenary Tractates*, No. 8, I, p. 716 (published privately 1933).

²⁴ Rev. W. R. Corbould, A.C.T. No. 8, II, p. 30.

²⁵ Rev. B. Leeming S.J. "*De Motu Oxoniensi*", *Gregorianum*, Ann. XV (1934), vol. XV, p. 177.

²⁶ Op. cit. 362.

²⁷ Church (R. W.), *Oxford Movement*, p. 298, footnote. London (Longmans), 1892, 3rd ed.

²⁸ Cf. Newman, *Anglican Difficulties*, IV, pp. 92-93. London (Burns & Lambert), 1850.

²⁹ Rev. Henry St. John, O.P.

³⁰ *Blackfriars*, XV, 172 (July 1934), p. 458. Cf. inter. alia, *ibid.* XVI, 185 (August 1935) and 179 (February 1935); and a controversy in the *Tablet*, Vol. 165, No. 4950, p. 358; No. 4951, p. 414; No. 4952, p. 446; No. 4953, p. 478.

³¹ Snead-Cox, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, II, p. 228. London (Herbert & Daniel), 1910.

³² *England and Christendom*, pp. 221-222. London (Longmans), 1897.

³³ Purcell, *Life of Phillips de Lisle*, I, 290-291. London (Macmillan), 1910.

³⁴ *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, pp. 332-339.

³⁵ *Life of Phillips de Lisle*, I, p. 285.

³⁶ *Blackfriars*, XV, 172 (July 1934), p. 461.

³⁷ Ward (W.) *Life of Wiseman*, I, p. 418. London (Longman), 1913.

³⁸ *England and Christendom*, pp. 83-133; Newman, *A Letter to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., etc.*, pp. 11-13. London (Longmans), 1866.

³⁹ Cf. Corbould (W. R.), loc. cit.

⁴⁰ Failure to perceive this is, in Pius XI's analysis, the root error of efforts at reunion such as Lausanne ('27); cf. *Mortalium animos*, 6 January, 1928, A.A.S. XX, 9.

⁴¹ V.g. perpetuation of heresy, indifferentism, etc.

⁴² Cf. Newman, loc. cit., footnote (36).

⁴³ Cf. Pius IX, Alloc. *Singulari quadam*, December 1854. D. 1647.

⁴⁴ Cf. Newman, *Essay on Development*, p. 88. London (Toovey), 1846.

⁴⁵ S.T. I, 22, 2, ad zum.

⁴⁶ S.T. I, 19, 9.

⁴⁷ Cf. Lennerz, *De Virtutibus Theologicis*, No. 245, p. 125. 3rd ed. Rome (Gregorian), 1933.

⁴⁸ The Branch Theory is only one way of explaining this.

⁴⁹ *Anglican Difficulties*, Lect. vi, p. 139.

⁵⁰ Whitton (T. W.), *Necessity for Catholic Reunion*, p. 58.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁵² Lord Halifax, *Foreword Anglo-Catholic Congress Handbook*.

⁵³ *The Oxford Movement, A Centenary Manifesto*, p. 3. (October 1932.)

⁵⁴ *England and Christendom*, p. lxxiii. London (Longman), 1867.

⁵⁵ *Conversations at Malines*, 1921-25. Oxford (Univ. Press), 1927.

⁵⁶ Example of partial Corporate Reunion in return to Church from Jacobitism of Mar Theophilus, Ivanios, Severios and Dioscoros Thoma, cf. *Universe*, 5 January, 1940.

⁵⁷ V.g. Caldey, Graymoor, Frensham, etc.

⁵⁸ e.g. *Month*, CLXII (1933), pp. 421 sqq. "Anglicanism Merely a Schism."

⁵⁹ "We have no intention of seceding from the Church of England. The aim and object which we have before us is to bring about under her

hierarchy
Holy
cf. *Le*
London
Decisions
survey
English
1934-
Essays
Cardin
Christi
Faith
for a d
(Long
II, pp.
(b)
the glo
Portal
d'Aujo
of Reli
Press),
1910-3
(figures
inconcl
Church
all this
sources
decision
The Oxf
and the
Monaste
commun
been ob
Hours i
each da
Our con
have al
Anglica
"Sn
"Le
"Ib
"An
Rome an
"Cf
1932; T
"Eis
"Lid
1898.
"Cf.
Canterbu
pp. 75-7
"Oth
"Cf.
20. Paris
"In
hundred
"Cf.

hierarchy the Corporate union of the Anglican communion with the Holy See." Corbould (W. R.), loc. cit.

⁶⁰ Cardinal Rampolla to Lord Halifax, letter dated 24 August, 1896; cf. *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, p. 351.

⁶¹ A single all-sufficient proof is *Doctrine in the Church of England* London (S.P.C.K.), 1938.

⁶² S.T. I, 22, 2, ad 2um.

⁶³ Cf. Anglican Difficulties, IV, p. 83.

⁶⁴ (a) Authority: Pius IX's view of Pusey, cf. Allies (T. W.) *A Life's Decision*, pp. 224-5. London (Kegan Paul), 1880. Leo XIII's optimistic survey, Litt. Apost. *Amantissimae voluntatis*, A.S.S. XXVII, 586 sqq. English trans. apud Messenger (E. C.), *Rome and Reunion*. London (B.O.W.), 1934. Cardinal Wiseman's welcoming attitude: *Tablet*, 3 April, 1841; *Essays on Various Subjects*, II, p. 93, footnote h. London (Dolman), 1853; Cardinal Manning: "The rise and expansion of a higher mind and a more Christian aspiration after union with God and His truth, and therefore after Faith and Unity, would tend to prepare the way for a happier future and for a day of reconciliation." *England and Christendom*, p. lxxiii. London (Longman), 1867. Cardinal Vaughan: Snead-Cox, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, II, pp. 156-7. London (Herbert & Daniel), 1910.

(b) History: There would seem to be a possible reading midway between the gloomy one of Canon Arenzden and the "roses-all-the-way" of Abbé Portal and Fr. St. John. I can only refer to: Coolen (G.), *L'Anglicanisme d'Aujourd'hui*, p. 145. Paris (Bloud & Gay), 1933; Cameron (A.T.), *Directory of Religious Communities in the Anglican Communion*. London (Faith Press), 1924 (both for statistics of Catholic practice). Conversion statistics 1910-35: Anglican Clergy 322, of whom 227 came from Anglo-Catholicism (figures furnished by Mr. Burges-Bayly). I cannot resist the perhaps inconclusive antithesis presented by this summary: "... the [Oxford Church] Movement was essentially in and of the Church of England, and in all this vast amount of learning and writing there is little from foreign sources and still less that accords with modern decrees, recent articles, and decisions of faith of the Roman Church as we see her now." (Wakeling (G.), *The Oxford Church Movement*, p. 309. London (Swan Sonnenschein), 1895); and the following quotation from a letter received from Mount Olivet Monastery, Frensham, Surrey, some little time before the reception of the community ("Servants of Christ the King") into the Church: "We have been obliged to fit our life to the work . . . and we now recite the Little Hours in private. Mass is heard daily and the Rosary recited in private each day. A short period of mental prayer and daily benediction. . . . Our constitutions follow as nearly as possible the New Codex. . . . We have always used the Latin tongue, and in common with a number of Anglican communities we use the missal. . . ."

⁶⁵ Snead-Cox, *Life*, II, pp. 156-7.

⁶⁶ *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, pp. 332-339.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 363, footnote.

⁶⁸ *Amantissimae voluntatis*, A.S.S. xxvii, English trans., Messenger (E. C.) *Rome and Reunion*, p. 125. London (B.O.W.), 1934.

⁶⁹ Cf. *Textus et Documenta*, Nos. 1 and 7. Romae (Univ. Gregoriana), 1932; Tromp (S.), *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, Romae (Greg.), 1937.

⁷⁰ *Eirenicon I.* Oxford, 1865.

⁷¹ Liddon (H. P.), *Life of Pusey*, IV, pp. 107 sqq. London (Longmans), 1898.

⁷² Cf. Speech at Lambeth Colloquy, 2 October, 1925, by Archbishop of Canterbury; vid. Frere (W. H.), *Recollections of Malines*, Addendum III, pp. 75-77. London (Centenary Press), 1935.

⁷³ Otherwise Var. Sess. III, cap. 3 (D. 1794), would be in peril.

⁷⁴ Cf. D'Herbigny (M.), *Theologia de Ecclesia*, II, Th. XVIII, n. 213, p. 20. Paris (Beauchesne), 1928.

⁷⁵ In what numbers unknown; some would say (approximately) one hundred times the clergy.

⁷⁶ Cf. letter of Wiseman, 1842; apud *Life of Phillips de Lisle*, I, p. 290, i.

⁷⁵ Cf. Billot, *De Ecclesia*, pp. 168 (and footnotes) sqq. Ed. 3a, Prati (Giachetti), 1909.

⁷⁶ Letter of Leo XIII to Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Vatican, 20 June, 1897. Latin text: Lacey (T. A.), *Roman Diary*, pp. 395 sqq. London (Longmans), 1910.

⁷⁷ Suarez, *De Fide*, disp. XVII, sec. i, ns. 6, 9, 10, 13. Salmanticenses, *Curs. Theol. Dogmat.* Tr. XVII, disp. ix, n. 9, 10.

⁷⁸ *One Lord—One Faith*, pp. 20 sqq., 11th imp. London (Sheed & Ward), 1930.

⁷⁹ Interesting to note that the Anglicans themselves have asked for just that from us: cf. Leaflet of Ch. Unity Octave, 1934.

⁸⁰ Cf. Leo XIII, *Amantissimae Voluntatis*, loc. cit. (p. 17.)

⁸¹ Letter to Phillips de Lisle, Oscott, 1842. *Life of Phillips de Lisle*, I, p. 290, i; Oscott, 1843, *Life of Wiseman* (W. Ward), I, p. 418. London (Longmans), 1912.

⁸² Ward (W.), *Life of Wiseman*, I, p. 418. London (Longman), 1913.

⁸³ Letter to Abbé Portal, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, p. 342. London (Longmans), 1912.

⁸⁴ 1841 in reference to the leaders of Oxford Movement, quoting Möhler; cf. *Life of Wiseman*, I, p. 404; cf. *Reunion*, Vol. I, 7 (December 1935) p. 207, xiii.

RICHARD ROLLE—ENGLISHMAN

ROLLE of Hampole belongs to the great company of the Universal Church. When he writes : "Man's soul is the taker of God only ; anything less than God cannot fulfill it", he shows himself akin to him who said : "Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee". In saying, "He truly knows God perfectly that feels him incomprehensible and unable to be known", he recalls Aquinas' profound remark :

The divine essence by its immensity surpasses every form to which our intellect reaches ; and thus we cannot apprehend it by knowing what it is. But we have some knowledge by knowing *what it is not* : and we shall approach all the nearer to the knowledge thereof according as we shall be enabled to remove by our intellect a greater number of things therefrom.

There are lyrics of his and numerous prose passages which parallel the more passionate lauds of Jacopone da Todi. The Tuscan singer himself, for instance, might have written this :

O honey-sweet heat, than all delight sweeter, than all
riches more delectable.

O my God ! O my Love ! into me glide ; with Thy charity
thirled ; with Thy beauty wounded :

Slide down and comfort me heavy ; give medicine to me,
wretched ;

Show Thyself to Thy lover.

Behold in Thee is all my desire, and all my heart seeks.

After Thee my heart desires ; after Thee my flesh thirsts.

And Thou openest not to me but turnest Thy Face.

Thou boltest Thy door, and hidest Thyself ; and at the
pains of the innocent Thou laughest.

Many of his sayings seem to cull the essence of Catholic sanctity. There is the wisdom of all the

saints in the *dictum* : "No creature truly can love too mickle. In all other things all that is too mickle turns to vice, but the more the strength of love surpasses the more glorious it shall be." There are echoes in his writings of St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Bernard, the two Victorines, Hugh and Richard, St. Bonaventura and others. Over and above all these, like most of his contemporaries, he was steeped in the Holy Scriptures and his Commentaries on them show that his knowledge of them was both extensive and profound. Did we need further evidence of his accord with Catholic Truth and tradition we should find it in his interpretation of the Athanasian Creed. His Faith was proof against the influences of Lollardy rampant in England during his later years.

The mystical movement with which he is identified, though strongly represented in this country by writers such as Mother Juliana of Norwich, Walter Hilton and the anonymous author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, was not specifically English. In the previous century great names had been added to the roll of Catholic mystics on the Continent, among which stands out that of Francis of Assisi. And with Francis, Rolle had many affinities. Indeed, the Hermit of Hampole is frequently referred to as the English Francis. A wave of spirituality had passed over Europe and the group of native writers mentioned witnesses to the fact that it had reached these shores. Though no mere imitators lacking original inspiration, the English Mystics were undoubtedly indebted to their kinsmen overseas. Nor is Rolle, perhaps the most original and distinctively English of them all, an exception to this. Frequently as he has been claimed as a precursor of the Reformation, his complete incorporation with and loyalty to the Mystical Body of Christ admits of no reasonable doubt.

But the mystery of the Incarnation whereby Divine Omnipresence took form among a specific

people is, in a sense, repeated in every case of individual sanctity. Catholicism, being a synthesis of the universal and the particular, sees no contradiction in the fact that the One Faith is expressed with varying racial accents. Rolle shows the possibility of being both Catholic and provincial. Seeing that it is with his provincialism that we are here mainly concerned, it may not be out of place to quote one whose *Life of the Hampole Hermit* entitles her to speak with authority. In the Foreword to that work Miss Comper says :

When Richard lived England had hardly ceased to be bilingual. The great religious houses which were so plentifully scattered over Yorkshire bore Norman names, and the greater part of their monks had come from France and even further afield. Yet in Richard we have a typical Englishman and, we might add, a typical Yorkshireman. Neither Yorkshire nor its people have ever lost their characteristics. There is a certain sturdiness of outlook, an independence and common sense, which we find stamped on all that Richard writes, that still refreshes us in Yorkshire even now, when we get off the beaten track.

She then goes on to compare him with St. Francis of Assisi.

If he had been born in Italy, probably he would have become a friar and followed Francis, to whom some have likened him. There are truly many points in common between the hermit who trod the wolds of Yorkshire, and the friar who toiled up the steep slope to the Carceri, and the still steeper slopes of the Penna ; yet it is a relation of contrast rather than of likeness. What comparison can there be between the son of a Yorkshire peasant and of an Umbrian merchant-prince of the ^{13th} ~~fourteenth~~ century ; between the shy sensitiveness of Richard and the unself-conscious abandonment of Francis ? It is partly because Richard is so typically English that he makes so strong an appeal to us. He would have had to meet a colder blast

than the winds which sweep across the wold if he had gone forth naked, as Francis, to espouse poverty. The *Fioretti* could never have blossomed in the soil of these northern moors ; they would have wilted and withered.

The conditions of the age were such as to emphasize these general considerations. Writing of one of Rolle's contemporaries, William Langland, in whom one similarly remarks a striking expression of the racial genius, M. Jusserand described the time as one in which

the nation, growing conscious of its own individuality, becomes decidedly averse to over-extension, does not want the Pyrenees for its frontier, nor a French town for its capital ; but seeks, on the contrary, whatever its leaders and kings may aspire to, to gather itself up, to concentrate its forces, to become a strong, well-defined, powerful body, and cease to be a large and loose invertebrate thing.

This account of the situation helps us to understand how it was that at this time the vernacular came to be employed by writers on religious subjects instead of the more customary Latin, a fashion which may be said to have been initiated by Rolle but was soon followed by others. The popularity of his writings support our contention that he embodied the English spirit. Exotics are not favoured by the common people. He who would speak to them must be of them. His ability to address himself to the uneducated is related to the fact that, like Langland who used the old, alliterative verse-form, Rolle belongs to the Saxon rather than to the Norman tradition. His style, as Dr. Horstman pointed out in his work on *Richard Rolle of Hampole and His Followers*, is that of the conquered rather than the conquerors.

The Saxon [says this authority], kept from satisfaction, is in perpetual unrest, perpetually consumed by the *trieb*

which he resists ; a prey to confused feelings and conceits which throng upon him and rapidly succeed each other ; of unbounded imagination, his mind is too full, too embarrassed to find expression, to sift, arrange, and lay clear its conceptions ; too restless to follow and develop a particular object until it is properly brought out and perfected. His ideas, born in the immediate truth of his own sensation and experience, are right enough ; he is an original thinker and has plenty of common sense ; his difficulty lies in the forming.

This is a fairly exact description of the style with which we meet in the writings under consideration. It was not the kind of style to attract the learned, nor was it intended for them. Rolle wrote for nuns and for the class to which the friars and Wyclif's preachers addressed themselves. Not until the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century did this section of the population once again hear religion preached in the same forthright English manner and with the same emotional intensity. Their response to it then may enable us to realize the kind of welcome given to the wandering preacher of the fourteenth century.

The few facts known concerning his outward life give an impression of robust independence and originality similar to that conveyed by his books. Assisted by Master Thomas de Neville, Archdeacon of Durham, he went early to Oxford. Here there seems to have been some conflict with the authorities, and, in any case, the scholastic discussions which engaged the interests of the University were little to his liking. Impatience with what he deemed their triviality and irrelevance to the main purpose of life as well as disciplinary measures may account for the fact that he returned home before completing his education. Whether he ever took Orders is doubtful. That he received the tonsure may be taken for granted but there is no evidence that he ever exercised sacerdotal functions. Having returned to

I sat forsooth in a chapel, and whilst I was greatly delighted with the sweetness of prayer or meditation, suddenly I felt within myself a wondrous strange heat.

But though at first I wavered, doubting of whom it should be, in course of time I became aware that it was not of a creature, but of my Maker, for I found it grow more hot and more delectable. In that truly sweet-savouring and unexpected heat I was occupied for half a year, three months and some weeks, with the inpouring and receiving of heavenly or spiritual sound, which belongs to the songs of everlasting praise and the sweetness of melodies unheard—for it may not be known or heard but by him who receives it, whom it behoves to be pure and quit of the earth.

The experience initiated a new stage in his career. He became once more a wanderer, but an apostolic wanderer intent on sharing his Secret with whomsoever was willing to receive it. Dr. Horstman has described this, the active side of his life, in a manner which, though imaginary, is probably not far from the actual facts :

He appeared [we are told] in the manor-houses of the neighbourhood, made friends with the lord, chatted with the women, cracked jokes with the girls, but all with the intent to preach his love, chastity and charity. . . . He appeared in the villages and mixed with the people, colloquially (as Socrates) not from the pulpit, inculcating love, loving-kindness, peace. He formed connections with clerics—one of his epistles (*cupienti mihi*) is addressed to a young priest. . . .

Finally he settled down in the vicinity of the nunnery at Hampole, near Doncaster, where he gave counsel to the nuns and others who came to him. He died there, possibly of the plague, in 1349. Miracles were said to have been wrought at his tomb, and soon after his death steps were taken to secure his canonization. But the times were stormy and critical, and his claims were forgotten. Perhaps at some future time they will be remembered.

The story we have told is that of a religious free-lance, one who was in both the physical and spiritual

sense an adventurer. His unconventional figure and the untrammelled liberty he enjoyed give some idea as to the width of range permitted within the framework of the mediaeval Church for the individualistic type.

This free-lance, it is suggested, was of the same breed as those seafaring adventurers and licensed pirates who made the reign of Elizabeth famous for maritime adventure and, unconscious of what they were doing, laid the foundations of the future British Empire. Belonging to a generation which was content, as we have seen, to abide within the four shores of this island and living in an age wherein the miseries of this present life were accentuated by plague, famine, agrarian revolt and ecclesiastical schism, Rolle, like others of his time, found an outlet for his adventure-loving and romantic disposition in the adventure of the Mystic Way and in the varied experiences of a spiritual tramp. May he not be said to have given us a sublimated version of the roving Englishman? He, too, turned himself loose in the world, differing in this from Drake and Frobisher and Raleigh only in the fact that the Star by which his course was guided is unmarked in any astronomical map and the winds on which he waited blew from off the coasts of the World Invisible. Not the Indies or Cathay was his goal but the port of Heaven, and to reach this required a higher courage and a greater heroism than was ever shown by the freebooters of the Spanish Main. This is the way in which, had they known the day of their visitation, England's adventure-loving sons might have found a better field for their daring than that provided by piracies on the high seas. It may be even suggested (so mysterious are the tides of national life) that it was because they had turned from the quest for God that they took, by way of compensation, to robbing the Don. It is possible to view their exploits as a perverse

alternative to voyagings after the style of Rolle's uncharted explorations in the mystic realm.

It may be instructive, however, to note the resemblances between our itinerant preacher and a type of Englishman very different from that of the sailors mentioned. After the upheaval of the sixteenth century the bulk of the nation settled down to a form of religion, under the patronage of the State, more remarkable for decorum than for the intenseness of its spirituality. A critic inclined to be cruel might even assert that the Establishment was more sensitive to the claims of social respectability than to those of supernatural sanctity. It soon became evident that a considerable section of the nation, and that the more popular element, found the arrangements made by a thoughtful Government for its eternal salvation uncongenial, and, in the absence of authoritative guidance, attempted to produce a religion of its own more in accordance with its native instincts. Thus there resulted three main types of English religious life—that represented by the historic Church reduced by penal conditions to a dutiful but somewhat timid and uninspiring practice of its customary rites, the State Establishment and a number of sects characterized by puritanical strictness and, at a later stage, evangelical fervour. The names of John Bunyan and John Wesley will serve to indicate their general outlook.

Now it is a remarkable thing that these Nonconformist bodies, relying, as has been said, on the native instincts of the unsophisticated rather than on directions dictated by the ecclesiastical policy of Elizabeth and her Ministers, did manage to reproduce many of the traits which had marked the popular religion of mediaeval times. English Catholicism in the fourteenth century, as regards its actual functioning, was a more comprehensive and popular thing than it has since become. And Rolle stood at the

parting of the ways, embodying in himself the elements which later were to become estranged from each other. What Mr. Christopher Dawson has said of Langland is true of the Hampole Hermit.

The spiritual successors of Langland [he has told us], are to be found not in the Catholic Church, nor even in the Church of England, but among the Puritans and the rebels, with Fox and Bunyan and Whitfield and Blake. But this popular tradition of English religion which was divorced from Catholic unity and even from the national unity after the sixteenth century already exists in its purest and most unadulterated form in the work of Langland. He shows us what English religion might have been, if it had not been broken by schism and narrowed by sectarianism and heresy.

It has been frequently assumed that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in this country were almost completely devoid of spirituality and that this was to be found only among the sectaries. But this view will not survive an examination of Rolle's writings and a knowledge of the popularity they enjoyed. Listen to him, for instance, as he sings :

And no marvel that he be glad thereof in this life that has lust ever to fulfil the desires of His Maker. Nothing is merrier than JESU to sing, nothing more delightful than JESU to hear. Hearing it truly mirths the mind ; and song up-lifts it. And truly, whiles I want this, sighing, and heavy as it were with hunger and thirst, I think myself forsaken. Forsooth when I feel the halsing and kissing of my Love, with untold delight as it were I overflow ; whom true lovers, for love only of His unmeasured goodness, set before all things. Coming therefore unto me, He comes inshedding perfect love. My heart also He refreshes, giving continuance ; He warms me, and also makes fat, all lettings to love putting away.

That is a note of passion which was to die out of English religion for many a year. But it must be

bal
the
hall

The
Chri
too
who
eatin
shou
pray
seem
natu
prais
I dw
feign
wher

T
as s
relig
and
Daw
Cath
char
by M
Essay
of W

The
ration
unnat
refres
leader
Midd
or eve
idealiz
them
the ea
ration

balanced by passages of another character displaying the common-sense and moderation which is the hall-mark of genuinely English devotion.

The true lover of Christ [says Rolle elsewhere], taught by Christ, with no less study guards against too much as against too little. He shall be beyond comparison more worthy who with joyful songs prays, meditates, reads and thinks, eating well but discreetly, rather than if without this he should always fast, eating bread alone, or herbs, and busily praying and reading. I have eaten and drunk of what seemed best, not because I loved pleasure, but because nature should be sustained in the service of God and in the praise of Jesus Christ, conforming myself to them with whom I dwelt in proper manner for Christ, that I should not feign holiness where none is nor men praise me too much where I was little to be praised.

This combination of passion and rationality is, as said, the distinctive mark of popular English religion. But it was a long time before they reappeared and then it was among those sects to which Mr. Dawson refers. It must be sadly confessed that the Catholic Revival failed to recapture these national characteristics. The reason has been lucidly stated by Mr. Bernard Lord Manning in the Thirlwall Essay for 1917, entitled : *The People's Faith in the Time of Wyclif*. Speaking of the Revival, he wrote :

The new movement found itself everywhere confronted by rationalism and Evangelicalism. Either separately or in unnatural alliance these held the field. When for the refreshment and enrichment of their barren times the leaders of the Revival turned back for inspiration to the Middle Ages, it was to be expected that they would overlook, or even deny, the presence of unattractive elements in those idealized centuries ; and all was unattractive which reminded them of the dominant influences of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. Their protest against the rationalism and Evangelicalism of their own day was as

natural as their inability to recognize either in mediaeval thought. But the need for their protest has now disappeared, and still to persist in seeing only one side of the picture would be as inexcusable as it is unnecessary. The romantic and "Catholic" elements in the mediaeval Church no one today is likely to forget, but it is not superfluous to recall its evangelical and its puritan qualities, its sanity, its commonsense, and its rationalism; to emphasize the fact that not only one half of modern Christianity but the whole has its roots in mediaeval religion.

Mr. Manning sees a particularly close resemblance between what he calls the "pious rhymes" of the fourteenth century and Evangelical hymnody.

These rhymes [he tells us], burdened with the faith and aspirations of an unknown multitude, come closer in sentiment to the *Hymns for the People called Methodist* than to anything in *The Temple* or *The Christian Year*. From those remote versifiers one can pass to Charles Wesley and be scarcely conscious of the change, for mediaeval religion has had its influence over many who have not felt its spell, and those who have been most sensitive to its spell have not always been most in harmony with its spirit. . . . For the mediaeval Church is the mother of us all.

There was a curious echo of this in a review of Miss Comper's volume, already mentioned, in *The English Churchman*, a weekly paper representing what is known as the Low Church. "Richard Rolle," declared the writer, "was the precursor of Walter Hilton, Julian of Norwich, William Langland, John Myrc and other mediaevals, who, while not unaffected by the superstition of their times, show more affinity with Evangelical Christians than any other school in the Church." After quoting one of Rolle's lyrics he went on to say: "Lines like these are closer far in sentiment to Watts' or Hart's than to the 'Catholic' piety of 'Lyra Apostolica' or 'The Christian

Year
well
soun
was
med
und
rese
to h
non
relig
pass
was
effec
But,
from
brea
of th
to th
of E
phas
In r
work
comp
auth
par e
poets
in wh
in a
whos
of ou
prof
temp
majo
past
has in
reaso
of La
Table

Year.' . . . From some of Rolle's verses one might well pass to Newton's 'How sweet the name of Jesus sounds' and be scarcely conscious of the change." It was the English spirit voiced through popular mediums which made itself heard in the religious underworld of sectarian Evangelicalism, and its resemblance to that of the Yorkshire mystic is a tribute to him as the interpreter of the native genius. The nonconforming sects rediscovered the possibilities of religious fervour, moral idealism, common sense and passion for freedom in the English character. But it was only a rediscovery. These qualities had functioned effectively in the popular religion of the Middle Ages. But, as Mr. Dawson says, "the English way diverged from the Catholic way". The Reformation made a breach with the past, so that, among the rank and file of the faithful, historical interests have been confined to the heroic sufferings of our martyrs and the coming of Emancipation. We have lost touch with that phase of Catholicism in which we were most ourselves. In regard to literature, Chaucer, exhibiting in his work both Italian and French influences, has almost completely eclipsed Langland who, according to the authority just quoted, was "the Catholic Englishman *par excellence*, at once the most English of Catholic poets and the most Catholic of English poets : a man in whom Catholic faith and national feeling are fused in a single flame". Langland, too, was a free-lance whose moral idealism and common sense was typical of our race, but, despite the fact that he had a far profounder religious sense than his brilliant contemporary, he remains almost unknown to the majority of English Catholics. This obscuration of a past wherein the native genius flourished exuberantly has involved Rolle and his fellow mystics. Not without reason did Miss Ruth Bethell, in verses reminiscent of Langland's measure contributed recently to *The Tablet*, cry out :

Who now hearkens who would hear tell
 Of the Ancren Riwe, of Richard Rolle?
 Heart whole for hope, holy for love,
 Merry with unknown heat, smiling, sweet-smelling,
 Bursting out singing for inward plenteousness,
 "Wherefore earthly loves never are fulfilled,
 Man's soul the taker of God only."

In view of the present situation, this state of affairs is not without its tragic aspect. The development of the war, emphasizing our insularity, seems likely to bring about a phase in our history similar to that described by M. Jusserand when "the nation, growing conscious of its own individuality . . . seeks . . . to gather itself up, to concentrate its forces, to become a strong, well-defined, powerful body, and cease to be a large and loose invertebrate thing". This makes it necessary that the gulf created between ourselves and mediaeval spirituality by the Reformation should be bridged. It is for those able to do so to interpret that spirituality in native and modern terms to those who, though prejudiced by what appears to them as the exoticism of the Church, might, in this hour of need, respond to a Faith that spoke in their own idiom. Rolle and his fellows may still play an important part in the conversion of that nation which he so faithfully represented.

STANLEY B. JAMES.

HOMILETICS

Feast of the Purification of Our Lady

I. This is at once a feast of our Lord and our Lady, and for both it is apparently most incongruous. How could *she* need purifying? How could *He* be presented to the Lord?

The answer is that we have here another instance of divine paradox—a consequence of the paradox of the Incarnation, the union of the divine and the human which must in the very nature of things be a paradox. How *can* God be a man? How *can* a man be God? And if it *could* be so, why *should* God become man, and what right has man to be thus united to God? Obviously it is no benefit to God to become man; it is for us men and for our salvation (cf. Nicene Creed, “Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem”). It is “the goodness and kindness of God our Saviour” (cf. Titus iii, 4: Epistle for Second Mass of Christmas Day).

II. OUR LADY’S PURIFICATION

She who is the purest of creatures, conceived without sin, “our tainted nature’s solitary boast”, whose virginal purity overshadowed by the power of the Most High (Luke i, 35) gave birth to the Son of God, obeyed the Law of Moses which demanded that a woman giving birth to a Son should present herself in the House of God after forty days of ritual uncleanness (cf. Leviticus xii, etc.) and there be cleansed and thus return to normal life. [Note on legal impurity and its purpose of impressing on the Israelites some idea of the tremendous holiness of God and the necessity of sinful man’s abasing himself before Him. Perhaps also add a few words about Churching of Women, which is described in the Ritual as the Blessing of Women after childbirth and which has as its dominant motive not purification but thanksgiving. Contrast N.T. Law of Love with O.T. Law of Fear, etc.]

Here we see our Lady’s wonderful humility. She would claim no special privileges, no exemptions from the common lot. Contrast our silly pride—our seeking to make ourselves

something whereas we are nothing (cf. Gal., vi, 3) ; our wretched attempts to impress others, etc. If Mary's Son could take upon Him the iniquity of us all (cf. Is., liii, etc.) His Mother would share His abasement, precisely because she was so intimately united to Him.

III. OUR LORD'S PRESENTATION

He who belongs entirely to God, who is in fact God, allows Himself to be offered to God like any common child. It is on a par with everything else in His life on earth. That life was lived not for Himself but for us. He shared in everything belonging to man because He was man ; He was in all things made like unto us, save only that the sins He bore were not His own, but ours. In Him, then, we were offered to God and the offering was accepted. Note that in His Sacrifice there was no robbery—He gave *everything*, and that from the beginning ; in our offering of ourselves, unfortunately, there is all too often much robbery. Like Ananias, we keep back a part, or rather we take back a part after having given it. At our baptism we are dedicated entirely to God : we renounce Satan and all his works and pomps ; but as soon as we are old enough we take back part of what we have given and begin to sin against God.

Today we might very well review our offering of ourselves to God, and ask to be purified from the stains of our sins.

Septuagesima Sunday

Septuagesima Sunday is always a bit of an unpleasant shock ! We seem to be hardly over Christmas (even in years when Easter is not too early) when the Church sounds the first warning about the coming of Lent. For that is what it really is. A preparation for the penitential season—a sort of mild introduction—letting us down lightly, so to speak, so that when Lent really begins it won't be too hard for us. And yet many of us feel we could very well do without this preliminary warning. Why can't we be left alone—time enough surely when Ash Wednesday comes to start talking about sin and repentance and mortification and other

horrid things of that sort. Yet there it is, and the Church very wisely leaves it in the Calendar. She knows what she is doing and she has chosen the lessons for the liturgy very suitably.

Both Epistle and Gospel today convey a message well worth our attention. In general they both contain a warning to us not to rest on our oars, not to be satisfied, even if we feel we are doing fairly well—especially not to think that we are, after all, the chosen people of God—those who have borne the burden of the day and the heats (Gospel), and feel ourselves better than so many others, who either are without the pale, or at any rate are late-comers and have not much to their credit.

In the Epistle we are reminded that if we are to do any good, we must keep ourselves in training. There is danger of getting flabby, of relying on our past efforts, of thinking we are all right. Just as those who compete at sport need to keep themselves fit, so do we. And when we think of the amount of trouble and self-denial athletes are willing to undertake for the sake of merely temporal glory, surely we must feel ashamed that we take so little pains to fit ourselves for eternal glory. We know what is the prize ("I then so run . . ." v. 26), and we know what we have to do to train ourselves (to bring the body into subjection, etc., v. 27). What fools we shall be if we do not take care to keep ourselves in training!

The Jews of old became careless and easy-going—nay, even over-confident and arrogant. They were the chosen people; they enjoyed God's special favour, they were all right, there was no need for them to bother themselves. The apostle warns us against a similar complacency. And so does the Gospel. There is a real danger for Catholics, especially those who go to Mass and Communion fairly regularly, particularly after many years in the Faith, of coming to think that *we* are all right. There is nothing much for us to worry about. In fact, when we compare ourselves with others who are not of the Faith, particularly those who don't go to church much (most of our neighbours) we are tempted to put on airs and think what a lot we really do. *We* don't stand round the market-place idle; we don't wait till the eleventh hour—we have been on the

job a long time and have many years' faithful service to our credit, etc. All very true, maybe—but even so, what of it? Are we so very marvellous after all? Does it amount to so very much, when we consider what we ought to be doing for God? Our Blessed Lord told us once that even when we have done *everything* we ought to have done we should remind ourselves that we are unprofitable servants at best (Luke xvii, 10). And is it true that we have done so much, anyway? Can we honestly say that what we have done bears any proportion to our privileges and responsibilities? Is it not true that we are giving ourselves airs, adopting the line taken by the earlier labourers in the vineyard who considered themselves so superior to those who came later than they had done? Let us be warned by this parable. Don't be too complacent about what you have done; don't live on your capital; don't imagine that, because to outward seeming you have done more for Almighty God than some of your neighbours, you have any right to think much of yourself. Don't take it easy; don't slack off. Be on your guard; there is a lot to be done yet—if you have time. Remember the day of reckoning is not so far off. Think rather of all the opportunities of service you have let slip. You may have spent many years in the service of God—yes, and you may not have used them to the best advantage. You have not worked every minute of every hour—you may have accomplished less in your many years than others who have been working for less time than you. Don't judge others; judge yourself. It is not your business what other people do; what matters to you is how *you* use your time. Be it long or short, the important thing is to use it *well*. This is what counts in the sight of the Master. Keep it up; don't slack off; don't get out of training; don't bother about what others do—these are the lessons of the Epistle and Gospel of today—a very good preparation for Lent—a very good recipe for all time.

Sexagesima Sunday (the Epistle)

This is undoubtedly a great piece of writing—and the man who wrote it was a great man and he knew it! When

Paul's adversaries belittled him, they did not know what they were asking for. He just annihilated them ! Sarcasm, scorn—it would be hard to find anything more devastating.

The Judaizers at Corinth, as elsewhere, were trying to put a spoke in St. Paul's wheel. They were jealous of his success, they did not like his methods, they wanted to upset his converts. Had it been purely a personal matter Paul would just have let them go on. He was too big a man to be bothered with mere personal affairs. As he said elsewhere, "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal., ii, 20). If it had been nothing more than his own reputation that was at stake, he would not have cared. When, however, it was Christ's work that was being injured ; when he found that his spiritual children were being upset, then he was ready to do battle. Woe betide anyone who tried to spoil the great work of bringing men to God !

The enemies of St. Paul tried to make out that he was of no importance and thus destroy his work, so that they might bring his converts round to their way of thinking. At the same time they boasted of their merits to gain authority and give an air of respectability to their ideas. In a few sentences St. Paul turns the tables on them. ("They are Hebrews . . . so am I . . . They are the ministers of Christ ; I am more . . .") and then he enumerates all he has gone through for the sake of the gospel—scourgings, shipwrecks, dangers by land and sea, from his own people, and from strangers, hunger, thirst, poverty, etc. It is simply overwhelming. Then he touches briefly on his special privileges—visions, etc. Those who criticized him must have felt ashamed of themselves ! If any of his correspondents had been led away, this tremendous revelation of the work of the Apostle must have brought them back at once.

Then, lest anyone should think too much of him, the Apostle speaks of his infirmities, the sting of his flesh which so much oppressed him that he sought to have it removed by God. Yet such was not God's will ; better far for it to remain, a constant reminder to the great Apostle of his humanity, a curb to save him from pride, an incentive to greater efforts, to prove that it is not man's but God's power which achieves such marvellous results.

For us who read today's Epistle it is an inspiration and

an encouragement, an incentive to generous devotion and loyalty in the service of Christ. What complete self-dedication to God and Christ it reveals! Nothing daunted the great Apostle. No effort is too much; no difficulty is too great; no sacrifice too hard to make for one who has given himself entirely to the service of God. On the contrary, the difficulties and sacrifices he has to make are a positive stimulus. The more he has to do, the more he wants to do. . . . What a rebuke to those who try to make Christianity easy and comfortable! Our Lord said, "He that will come after Me, let him take up his cross daily and follow Me" (Luke ix, 23). This war has shown that the greater the demands that are made on men, the more eager they become. Who would have thought that modern, easy-going, pleasure-loving young men and women (and even older ones too) could rise to such heights of devotion and sacrifice? Our enemies were convinced that we were effete—they thought we could not give up everything for our ideals. Even we ourselves hardly guessed it. Yes, it needs a great challenge to bring out the best that is in men. Let the challenge of today's Epistle stir our souls to their very depths. Into the fight against temptation, sin, selfishness, sloth and all the other evils we have to meet, let us throw everything that we have, remembering that the weaker we are in ourselves, the stronger we are in Him who is our strength. Virtue is increased by struggle and holiness comes only by fighting against its opposite. Ease, comfort, pleasure, luxury, these things are enervating. Thank God for the chance to fight, to show ourselves worthy of our Master who Himself eschewed ease and comfort, who having glory and honour set before him chose rather sorrow and pain and even death itself. And let the noble example of our ancestors in the Faith, the Saints of God, and especially of St. Paul, encourage and inspire us.

Quinquagesima Sunday

The great lesson of today is the supreme place that charity holds in the Christian scheme of life.

It is an old jibe against Christians that the great test of the worth of their religion, viz. love, so often finds them

wanting, and unfortunately only too often the complaint is justified. How many there are, even amongst the pious, whose lives seem almost destitute of any real Christian charity! How many there are outside who, so far as their limits will allow, seem to have far more love for their fellows than some of us!

The burning words of St. Paul in the Epistle of today must surely have a direct message for us. Prophecy, miracles, etc.—all these are nothing without charity.

Lest, however, we get the message all wrong, let us be sure that when we talk of Charity we know what we mean. Charity is that virtue by which we love God above all things and our neighbour as ourselves for God's sake. Note first, Charity is love of God, and love of God not just for what we can get from God, but love of God for God's sake: love of God because God is supremely lovable. We love things because they are good; God is infinitely Good—entirely and absolutely good, entirely and absolutely lovable in consequence. This, however, is apt to strike us as rather abstract and not too easy to get at. God is a hidden God and the world we live in is so confusing that, though it is a reflection of God in some sort, it is not easy for us to appreciate God's goodness as we ought. There is so much that is evil, God's purposes are so obscure to our limited intelligence that it is hard, especially at a time like this, to realize that God is so good and therefore so lovable. God is not unheeding of this difficulty; He knows how hard it is for man to see through all the dreadful evil that is in the world and to direct his mind and heart to God as he should. It was to make God's love clearer to men that the miracle of the Incarnation was accomplished. God sent His Son into the world to reveal to man how much God loves man, and thus show him how truly lovable God is. Jesus Christ is God made man, the infinite goodness of God made visible to man. When we look on Him we look on God. ("Philip, he that seeth Me, seeth the Father." John xiv, 9.) Everything He did shows us something of the infinite goodness and therefore loveliness of God. Thus in the Gospel of today our Lord's dealing with the blind man at the gate of Jericho reveals to us at once God's love for us, and what our love for our fellow men (which is the direct consequence

of our love for God) should be. How easy it is to see God's love for men revealed in this action of our Blessed Lord ! To love a God who came amongst us as did the Incarnate Son of God requires no power of abstract thought, no philosophical training. It is enough to see God's love in action to realize something at least of how great and good, and therefore how lovable, He is. And having seen how lovable God is, can we fail to love Him ?

We start then by loving God, simply because He is so lovable. But we cannot stop here. If we love God we must love what God loves—we must love our fellow men, because they belong to God and because God loves them. Oh yes, they are imperfect—well we know it !—but God loves them all the same ; and if He loves them, that is enough for us—we love them too. Not *because* they are imperfect, but because in spite of their imperfections they are lovable—they must be, otherwise God would not love them—in fact could not love them—nor could we. They are God's creatures, made to His own image and likeness (faint, it is true—but still there if we have eyes to see it) ; and those of them who are Christians are not only God's creatures but also His children, adopted sons, members of His family—brothers and sisters of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.

As already remarked, our Lord's dealings with men are a pattern for us. As He dealt with them, so should we deal with them. Throughout the Gospels, as in the incident of the blind man in today's extract, we find our Lord dealing with men, not as a master dealing with servants, but as one who loved men and treated them as his fellows. Kind, courteous, considerate, patient, rejecting no one, compelling no one. This is what loving our neighbour really means. The term of comparison is loving our neighbour *as ourselves*—treating him, that is, as we wish to be treated—surely a not impossible thing to do, when one considers the matter quietly. Yet, as we know from experience, few of us consistently do. For a time, yes ; in favourable conditions, yes—but not consistently. Something goes wrong, and charity fails ! We are far too much self-centred—too busy about our own affairs, too anxious that everything concerning ourselves should be all right.

Turn
Let
sent
tion
abo
of c
wate
them
and
Lor
man
anno
sister
of th
anno
same
go o
His i
as we
lovin
is pa
cent
what
us to
too ;
all H
Fathe

What is the remedy? God. Turn away from self. Turn outwards—first to God and then to our neighbour. Let our love for God be the genuine article—not sticky, sentimental piety—not so much thinking of our own salvation—our own progress—our own merit—but thinking about God. Let Him be the centre of our lives—the focus of our spiritual gaze. Especially let us look at Christ—watch Him as He deals with men. Note how He treats them. Read the Gospels and read them with appreciation and then try to deal with men in the same way that our Lord did. Try to see what He saw—not just the outward man, not the imperfect creature whose uncouthness is so annoying, but see in your fellow men, your brothers and sisters in the Lord, and see too in yourself a fellow creature of theirs, whose imperfections and uncouthness are just as annoying to them as theirs are to you. We are all in the same predicament—we are fellow sinners. How God can go on loving us in spite of our sinfulness is only explicable by His infinite goodness—and if we love God's infinite goodness as we say we do, we shall not find it impossible to share His loving kindness for men. Thus we shall prove that charity is patient, is kind, even as St. Paul says in today's magnificent Epistle; and that it never fades away, no matter what happens; and that also it remains to the end, uniting us to God our Father, not only in this world, but in Heaven too; and that because it unites us to Him, it unites us to all His children, together with whom we shall rejoice in our Father's House for ever.

W. GORDON.

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

(*Hidden Life* continued ; *The Holy Family* ; *Family Life* ; *the Sacrament of Matrimony* ; *St. Joseph* ; *the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*)

IN the previous instructions Our Lord was spoken of as an individual, a private person, almost as if no one else existed except Himself and His Father in Heaven, and we spoke about ourselves in much the same way.

The truth about our own importance as individuals because God created us in His own image and likeness ; because Jesus Christ has redeemed us ; because we are capable of receiving Sanctifying Grace, needs to be taught with more emphasis today than was ever necessary since the first years of Christianity.

Then the poor, the weak, the infirm—slaves, prisoners, children, the sick and the old—were not *considered* or treated as if they were of any importance in themselves as individuals, but no one taught this as a doctrine. Now it is taught by Communist, by Nazi, and to a large extent by Fascist, that no one is of any importance in himself as an individual but only in his relation to the State, i.e. in so far as he is useful to the State.

What is the truth ? The truth is that while we are of importance as individuals—simply as men or women or children—because of the reasons given above, we are also important as members of a family, of a State, of the Church. Why ?

To answer that question we must know what these three things, or institutions, are for.

Very roughly the Church is for all ; the State is for the families that constitute it ; the families are for the individuals. The Church teaches us our duties to God and to our fellow men ; the State protects us, giving us liberty so that we are free to perform those duties ; in the family we learn what the Church teaches and normally have the best opportunities of growing in the practice of virtue, i.e. goodness.

Therefore we answer the question, "Why are we important as members of family, State, Church ?" because, as mem-

bers of these, we have great opportunities of sanctifying ourselves by working for the glory of God, i.e. that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven, and for the material and spiritual welfare of our fellow men. And that is what life is for. Here we deal only with the family.

The Holy Family

God the Son might have taken a body and become man without having a human mother—just as He had made Adam of whom we read in the Book of Genesis : "The Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth and breathed into his face the breath of life ; and man became a living soul."

But God in His infinite goodness chose to have a human mother, the ever blessed Virgin Mary, a woman who was already married to a man, St. Joseph. Our Lady was His real mother : St. Joseph was not His real father—this will be explained when we come to marriage and the Sacrament of matrimony—but as they were husband and wife everybody at the time thought He was their child.

Among the many immense advantages we derive from this choice of Almighty God is this one that in the Holy Family we have the perfect example of family life : fathers have their model in St. Joseph, mothers in Our Lady and children in the Holy Child Jesus.

What then is the special virtue or goodness of family life ? To say it is the ideal way of developing our characters, though true, sounds dull : to say it is the ideal way of learning how to develop what is best in us, is the same thing put in a better way : perhaps the best way is to say that in family life we have the ideal opportunity of learning to love each other truly as God wishes us to love each other and through this true love to learn how to love God.

True love is unselfish and unchangeable and brings to us the greatest natural happiness we can have on earth.

In the ideal family the husband puts his wife before himself ; he loves her and works for her ; the wife puts her husband before herself ; she loves him and devotes herself to him : then as the children are born both father

and mother put the children first and unite in working for and devoting themselves to them. The children begin by loving their parents for what they get from them—one cannot call this selfish, it is just natural ; but then very soon they begin to love their parents for their own sakes, being grateful even if they don't know what the word means ; then later they begin to want to do something for their parents, to help, to give, not merely to be only receiving ; they are growing unselfish quite naturally. From their parents they learn about God. Because their parents love God, they love Him ; they learn what He has done for them, what He has in store for them, how Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem a little child like themselves, and very soon they are loving Him not merely because their parents love Him but for His own sake and because they are grateful. With that spirit in the home, the children practise different virtues long before they know them by any names ; they are obedient to their parents because they want to please them ; they are kind and forgiving to each other because they really love each other ; of course they are naughty sometimes but they are quickly sorry and their motive for their sorrow, even if they do not know it, is love, they are sorry to have distressed those whom they love. As they grow older they look forward to the time when they too will be mothers and fathers with children of their own to love and look after.

NOTE 1. All this will sound rubbish to children who come from bad homes. One does not want to make them more conscious of their parents' shortcomings. The only way out seems to me to be that of excusing all parents thus : Of course, this happy picture supposes all parents to be perfect, and all children too ; if they were they would not be human ; the parents, like the children, have to grow in virtue ; some grow quicker than others ; we must not be looking to find faults in others but in ourselves ; but it remains true that the better the parents and the better the children the holier and therefore the happier the home will be. Can you do anything to make your home holier and happier ?

NOTE 2. Orphans : by themselves or with other children. One does not want to make them pity themselves

too m
does o
not w
suffer
that C
graces
Nuns
and if
must l
and to
selves

Marria

W
marria

M
woma
dies.

united
joining
party
with s
into p

W
(1) M
sharing
with, C

Bo
tioned
connec
God-se
they h
creativ
childre
Each c
For ea
child l
with "
childre
differen
things-

too much, think themselves inferior, badly treated ; nor does one want to make out that they have missed something not worth having. I can only suggest : that they have suffered a great misfortune through no fault of theirs and that God will in His Providence make up to them by special graces, interior and exterior (i.e. kind relations or kind Nuns or Brothers who try to take the place of their parents) and if they have not known a real home life as children they must look forward to a real home life when they are married, and to give to their own children the love that they themselves have missed.

Marriage

What is marriage? What is marriage for? Why is marriage connected with religion?

Marriage is the permanent union of one man with one woman. Permanent means lasting till one or the other dies. Union more difficult to explain. People can be united for various purposes and for various times, e.g. joining a football club or a dramatic society or a political party where many are united, or by going into partnership with somebody for some business. Marriage is the going into partnership with someone for life.

What is marriage for? Mainly for these two purposes : (1) Mutual comfort, support, helpfulness in bearing by sharing the difficulties of life ; (2) Co-operating, working with, God by bringing children into the world.

Both these purposes, but especially the second mentioned, give the answer to our third question. Marriage is connected with religion because it is a help to living a good, God-serving, holy life and because married people, when they have children, are so closely united with God in His creative work. For the parents do not give the soul to their children. For each child God creates an immortal soul. Each child born has already been redeemed by Jesus Christ. For each child there is a destined place in heaven. Each child has been foreseen and loved by God for all eternity with "an everlasting love". That is why the bringing of children into the world is a holy and sacred thing, very different from the bringing into the world of other living things—animals, birds, fish, plants.

All living things have been made by God male and female, even trees, plants, etc., and to all, by the union of male and female, has been given the power of producing young of their own kind ; but the union of all other living things, unlike that of husband and wife, is only for a short time. Sometimes the male, as in the case of dogs, cats, bulls, horses and most other animals, leaves the female before the young are born and she has to bring up her family by herself ; sometimes, as in the case of birds, lions, beavers and others, the male remains to provide food and protection for the female and the young till the young are able to fend for themselves, when both male and female desert them and go their several ways ; sometimes, as in the case of fish and certain insects, both male and female go away before the young are born, the female having laid her spawn or eggs in a suitable place with food provided where the young hatch out of themselves. Wonderful *instincts* given to all these creatures—nesting, food-finding, etc., but all done without *reason* and without *lasting affection* either of male or female or of both or either for their young.

Why so different in the case of men and women? Because they are made in the image and likeness of God. They have *reason* to know what they are doing and why God wishes them as husband and wife to love each other and their children with real love, and real love, like the love of God, is unchanging. Indeed St. Paul tells us that marriage represents in many ways the union of Jesus Christ with His Church. The animals have only to prepare their young for physical life, which is quickly and easily done. Human parents have to prepare their young for spiritual life as well, which is far more important and eternal and the teaching of which must be slow and gradual and not taught as an extra, a side issue, but as the very essence of the value of life. So we come back to the importance of family life ; for the parents, practising Christian virtues, doing the Will of God, drawing nearer and nearer to Him ; for the children, being taught about God and virtue and learning how to do His Holy Will.

To emphasize all this Our Lord raised the natural contract of marriage to a Sacrament : the man gives the Sacrament to the woman, the woman to the man, and

whil
a gr
pled
lives

St. J
S
the f
God
He
to b
reali
thou
mon
hem
chilc
nine
the p
Of C
by th
of th
wom
her h
of th
who

S
to b
the h
Our
in th
the i
Temp
have

S
unsel
Child
such
The C
he wa
the C
Chur

while the Sacrament gives to each at the time of its reception a great increase of sanctifying grace, it also contains the pledge of continual actual grace throughout their married lives.

St. Joseph

St. Joseph was the husband of Our Lady but he was not the father of Jesus Christ. Our Lord had no earthly father : God the Son was the eternal Son of God the Father ; when He became man He chose to have a human mother and to be born apparently as all other children are born, but in reality, as we know from St. Luke's Gospel, Our Lady, though she became His Mother and carried Him for nine months in her womb before giving birth to Him at Bethlehem, remained always a virgin. When a woman has a child in her womb we say that she has conceived ; after nine months the child is born. The woman conceives by the powers that God has given to her and to her husband. Of Our Lord we say in the Creed that : "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost". By that we mean that by the power of the Holy Ghost the Child Jesus was conceived in the womb of Our Blessed Lady, not by the power of St. Joseph her husband. This was a miracle and is called the miracle of the Virgin Birth because Our Lady is the only woman who is both a virgin and a mother.

St. Joseph's great privilege is that he was chosen by God to be the protector or guardian of Jesus Christ. He was the head of the Holy Family ; he had real authority over Our Lady and over Jesus Christ. The last mention of him in the New Testament as still living is immediately after the incident of the loss and finding of the Child Jesus in the Temple, so that we do not know when he died but it must have been before the Public Life of Our Lord.

St. Joseph's faithfulness to his charge, his humility and unselfishness, his tender love for Our Lady and the Divine Child make everybody feel a great devotion to him. He is such a homely saint that no one can feel afraid of him. The Church has made him Patron of all families and because he was the head of the Holy Family and had charge of it, the Church has declared him to be Patron of the whole Church ; the saints in heaven have no need of a patron,

but St. Joseph is the Patron of the Church on earth and the Church suffering in Purgatory.

Because St. Joseph must have been attended on his death-bed by Our Lady and Our Lord, he is very naturally the Patron of a Happy Death. Our Lady can and will pray for us in a very special way when we are dying: all the millions of Hail Marys we have said contain the phrase: *at the hour of our death*: that so-many-times-repeated prayer has not been and could not have been answered till the time of our death comes, so then though Our Lady cannot minister to us bodily, as she did to St. Joseph, she can and will spiritually. How will Our Lord help us? He has instituted a special Sacrament through which He will minister to us not only when we are actually dying but whenever through illness we are in danger of dying.

The Sacrament of Extreme Unction

Effects of this Sacrament twofold:

- (1) The set of effects in the various cases of people who are really dying and will soon be dead.
- (2) The set of effects when the people appear to be dying but in fact, after receiving the Sacrament, recover.

Take (2) first. It is certain that this Sacrament *sometimes* restores bodily health. When? In general when God sees it will be expedient for the soul's salvation, i.e. that the person will be holier and better prepared for death later on. How? Not necessarily by any miracle but by natural bodily powers stimulated by the supernatural power of the Sacrament.

Many priests have noticed how often sick people in hospitals (I noticed it frequently with wounded soldiers) groaning and moaning and tossing about, become immediately quiet and peaceful after being anointed. They know everything that can be done for them has been done, they are spiritually at peace, they trust themselves to God, they no longer waste their energies fretting and being restless and so have a new chance of recovery.

Now for (1).

(a) A man in a state of mortal sin and unconscious, if immediately before becoming unconscious he made an

act of contrition, with very little love, not by any means an act of perfect contrition, or even if he made only an act of attrition, would receive sanctifying grace and his soul would be saved. If he did not do even this but always had the intention of going to confession and making his peace with God, it is still possible, though not certain, that in this Sacrament he would receive sanctifying grace.

(b) A man in the state of grace receives a great increase of sanctifying grace so that he will have a higher place in heaven than if he had not received it. Also he will certainly receive some remission of the temporal punishment which may still be due for his forgiven sins.

Many theologians believe that if this Sacrament is properly received, i.e. to the best of the man's ability, *all* the effects of his forgiven sins are remitted and that the proper effect of this Sacrament is to make the dying person fit for immediate entrance into heaven. St. Egbert of York is quoted as saying that the soul of one who has died after being anointed should be as pure as the soul of a child who has died after being baptized.

FRANCIS C. DEVAS, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. MORAL THEOLOGY

MGR. CRONIN'S *Science of Ethics*, though somewhat expensive, is probably the manual which is chiefly consulted by educated Catholic laymen in this country. The new edition of the second volume, *Special Ethics*,¹ contains much additional matter, and notably in *Appendix E* an examination of some medico-moral problems which are not usually included in ethical manuals. Indeed, with the exception of Fr. Davis's *Manual of Moral Theology*, Vol. II, the subject is treated rather remissly in most of the theological text-books. The questions are mostly of gynaecological interest, and their inclusion in this standard work will bring sound ethical teaching on these subjects to the notice of a wide public. Mgr. Cronin records the view, and appears to regard it himself as probably correct, that in ectopic gestation the tube itself may be removed, without direct interference with its contents, even though it happens to contain a living fetus. This is now very commonly held by moral theologians and we think it is the true solution of a difficult problem.

In view of the prominence given in Vol. I to the natural and unnatural use of human faculties, as exemplifying the application of the primary moral criterion, it is somewhat disappointing to find so slight a discussion in Vol. II of the value of this norm as an ethical argument against contraception, particularly as much space is given to other less acute problems connected with marriage and sex.

Writing, as we are at the moment, with a Home Guard post practically on the doorstep, and with bombs exploding all around, the theory of what is ethically permitted in warfare has more than a purely academic interest. We may, therefore, be excused if we confine the following notes wholly to the subject of war. Whilst presenting the Thomistic doctrine, as on all other questions raised in his book, Mgr. Cronin also gives us the fruit of his own reflections. We learned, at first with considerable surprise, that in a

¹ *The Science of Ethics*. Vol. II. Pp. 707. (Gill & Co., Dublin. Price 17s. 6d.)

just war all *direct* killing of enemy combatants is forbidden by the natural law. The reason for this, as analysed by the author, is to be discovered in the analogy between warfare and the act of legitimate self-defence against an unjust aggressor. This latter problem is one of the minor difficulties of the moral theologian which has not yet been solved in an entirely satisfactory manner. Most of the writers, following St. Thomas, teach that a private individual may never intend directly to kill the aggressor, and some extremely fine distinctions have to be employed to justify such killing whenever legitimate self-defence cannot otherwise be maintained. The best solution, we think, is the one proposed by Dr. Van Hove in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1929, page 655, namely, that the common good and not merely the private good of an individual is usually at stake, and that, therefore, the direct killing of an aggressor may, in certain circumstances, be intended because sanctioned by the State. But, whatever may be the truth in this argumentation, and whatever may be the limitations to one's right of self-defence against an individual unjust aggressor, St. Thomas teaches with perfect clarity that the intention directly to kill enemy combatants in war is lawful : "illicitum est, quod homo intendat occidere hominem, ut seipsum defendat, nisi ei qui habet publicam auctoritatem, qui intendens hominem occidere ad sui defensionem, refert hoc ad publicum bonum, ut patet in milite pugnante contra hostes, et in ministro iudicis pugnante contra latrones." Nevertheless, in spite of the disparity between Mgr. Cronin's view and that of St. Thomas, it will be found that the former has very much to be said in its favour : for example, the wrong of using poisoned or explosive bullets is explained in terms of natural law rather than of international convention ; incidentally also, the use of non-lethal gases is seen to be in itself lawful. But we would not go so far as to say, with Mgr. Cronin, that the truth of his proposition is self-evident.

Theological discussions amongst Catholics in this country on the right of waging war have, since the present conflict, been confined for the most part to periodical and pamphlet literature. It may have been noticed that, in these discussions and in letters to the Press, considerable use is made

of the work of a non-Catholic scholar, *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, by Dr. C. J. Cadoux, first published at the close of the last war in 1919. A cheap reprint of this study has now appeared¹ and its chief interest for us is perhaps the fact that it contains a preface by Dr. W. E. Orchard, in which, amongst other things, the author's keen scholarly powers and his profound reverence for truth are commended.

Everyone would, we think, wholly agree with this praise of Dr. Cadoux whose work is the only book of its kind in English. The author is a pacifist by conviction, and he holds the belief that his views are supported by the teaching of Our Lord and by the witness of the early Church. But he has not written primarily in order to prove his case, nor to construct a piece of propaganda which, following the lines of such literature, carefully selects all favourable facts and arguments whilst omitting or putting the worst possible construction upon those which are unfavourable. The book is meant to be, and is, an historical and exegetical study of the subject. Dr. Cadoux sets out impartially those statements of Our Lord which appear to condemn war and those which appear to sanction it. There follows a similar examination, on the one hand, of those texts which record the early Christian disapproval of war, and, on the other hand, of the evidence which appears to indicate that early Christians accepted war as not being, at least, clearly opposed to their religious profession. The texts are given, very often in full, with the relevant words in the Latin or Greek original—the reader will grow accustomed to the unusual spelling of proper names, for example, Khrusotomos, Eirenaïos, Basilios—and the independent student can draw his own conclusions from the information given. It must be remarked, nevertheless, that Dr. Cadoux does not conceal his own convictions throughout this study, least of all in the closing pages of summary. When he writes, for instance, that "in view of all that we have just seen of pre-Constantinian times and in view of the subsequent history of Europe, it is difficult to resist the impression that the Church took a false step when she abandoned her earlier and more rigorous principles", he is assuming on

¹ George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. Pp. 272. Price 5s.

the par
to exist
ponder

A
include
Attwat
Dilemm
which,
all logi
view.
firstly,
and, se
attemp
has no
"All h
of the
busines
are als
people,
larly th
defence
relative
Mr. A
situatio
should
Rev. A
and on
conclus
present
reconc
becaus
clear t
none".

In
of the
notice
traditi
Moral
that th

¹ Ed.
² Cf.

the part of the Church a *volte-face* which he has not proved to exist. He should not therefore be surprised at a correspondent of his observing that he "fails to prove his case."

A *symposium* entitled *This War and Christian Ethics*¹ includes papers by Fr. Gerald Vann, O.P., and Mr. Donald Attwater. Mr. Attwater's contribution, *The Modern Dilemma*, does not fit in well with the remaining essays which, as one would expect from the title of the book, are all logical and orderly expositions of the writers' points of view. A just appraisal of this essay is rendered difficult, firstly, because it is not too clear what the dilemma is; and, secondly, because the author admits that he does not attempt an ordered argument or exposition, and that he has no one particular thing that he wants to say or discuss. "All he wants to do is to set out, almost at random, some of the things that many people find puzzling in this war business. . . ." But it is only fair to point out that there are also things which many people, especially Catholic people, find puzzling about this pacifist business, particularly the incoherence of a position which forbids the armed defence of one's country yet permits force in defending relatives, friends and neighbours against unjust aggression. Mr. Attwater thinks that a comparison between the two situations is a false analogy, a metaphor misused; but we should like to know why. In *The Theology of Pacifism*, by Rev. Alec R. Vidler, we have, on the other hand, a thoughtful and ordered examination of its difficulties, the author's conclusion being that "our attitude as Christians to the present war cannot be settled, nor differing attitudes reconciled, by any general solution of the pacifist question, because there is none—although it would wholesomely clear the air if we reached agreement as to why there is none".

In one particular at least—in discussing the obligations of the individual conscience—a discerning reader will notice that Fr. Gerald Vann leans more to the side of traditional teaching than he does in his book entitled *Morality and War*². The reason for this must be, we think, that the book was written before the outbreak of war and

¹ Edited by Ashley Sampson. Pp. 195. (Blackwell, Oxford. Price 6s.)

² Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, Vol. XVIII, p. 253.

contains the author's individual contribution to the theology of the subject, whereas the article in this *symposium* is headed *The Teaching of the Church*, and sets out the doctrine which all Catholics, as such, hold in common. The requirements for a just war, as formulated by the Catholic Social Guild in the *Code of International Ethics*, which is regarded by Fr. Vann as a conservative exposition, provide the basis of this common teaching, and a clear and useful summary of these requirements is given. From the *Osservatore Romano*, 4 and 5 September, 1939, a telling extract is quoted against the lawfulness of air bombardments upon non-military objectives: "Nothing more deeply wounds the civilized conscience than such transgression of the very laws of humanity; the more so since for seven centuries the Church in her Councils has declared the inviolability of civilian populations—and, what is more, of their work, their fields, their workshops, their houses—from every assault of war. . . . Reprisals against civilian populations are a monstrous thing. The innocent would still pay for the guilty. Against the innocent victims of the one side would be set the innocent victims of the other. Not thus are humanity and offended justice to be appeased; this is no repayment of injuries; it is complicity in a crime—a crime not only as towards the contending parties, but first and foremost before the loftiest aspirations of life, of reason, of the heart of man. . . . God is to be propitiated, not to be defied. Far from appeasing His vengeance, nothing can more loudly cry out for it than bloody havoc wrought on these weakest ones who are even now suffering the pangs of a ghastly trial in which they have no hand."

Dr. John Lewis, in his book *The Case Against Pacifism*¹, deals, amongst other things, with the moral aspects of waging war, and a whole chapter is entitled "Pacifism and Christianity". But he is chiefly concerned with the question from the historical and political point of view, examining, for example, the argument that force has achieved nothing of value in the history of the world. One would not, therefore, expect to find an expert treatment of the theological arguments against pacifism, particularly as the writer is of the opinion that the Christian pacifist movement today

¹ George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. Pp. 238. Price 2s. 6d.

is chiefly due to the influence of Tolstoi. The book, nevertheless, contains many trenchant and very true observations on those texts of the Gospel which are supposed to condemn warfare in all circumstances. In pleading for a Christian attitude towards war which insists on its stern necessity under certain conditions, but makes every effort to mitigate its horrors and wage it only in a just cause, Dr. Lewis is expressing as a matter of fact, the accepted doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject.

The teaching of Pope Pius XII, before and during the present conflict, is admirably set out by Fr. Lewis Watt, S.J., in this year's *Catholic Social Year Book*.¹ It is clearly summarized in the "Five Peace Points" which the Holy Father put before the College of Cardinals on Christmas Eve, 1939, the text of which has been translated by Canon Smith and published by the *Catholic Truth Society*.² Since the statement is itself quite clear and simple, its arrangement by Fr. Randall, C.M.S., in the form of a Catechism³ might appear to many as unnecessary. But it is surprising how much can be missed by a superficial reading of the text of any papal utterance, and this little Catechism is strongly recommended for its arrangement of the doctrine, for its useful index, and incidentally for its vindication of the catechetical method of teaching. Amongst much of the pamphlet literature occasioned by the war we may mention *God and This War*⁴ by Fr. J. J. Bevan, for its purely spiritual outlook on the sufferings of people at this time; *Peace and War*, by Fr. G. J. McGillivray⁵ and *War and Pacifism*, by Fr. H. Davis, S.J., present the moral teaching of the Church in a popular form.⁶ As in everything Fr. Davis has written, we find here a plain solution to the problems of the individual conscience, without the "hedging" tactics of which we moral theologians are so often guilty. Who, for example, is to decide whether a war is just or unjust? There can be no doubt that Fr. Davis's answer accurately represents the teaching of the Church: "It must be obvious that the individual citizen, including the conscientious pacifist, can rarely decide so momentous a question, for he is not in a

¹ *Pope Pius XII on World Order*. Pp. 80. (C.S.G., Oxford. 1s.)

² *The Pope's Five Peace Points*. S. 153. Price 2d.

³ *A Catechism of the Pope's Peace Points*. (Catholic Gazette. Price 2d.)

⁴ C.T.S. Do. 198.

⁵ C.T.S. Do. 199.

⁶ C.T.S. Do. 199 and 204.

position to know all the circumstances. So that, if a State is, as a fact, unjustly attacked and calls upon its citizens to defend it, the pacifist attitude may not be adopted by any Catholic, or any other Christian, or indeed by any reasonable man, since the rational presumption is, unless the contrary is quite evident, that the State has come to its decision on just and sufficient grounds."

E. J. MAHONEY.

II. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

Two recent books make one realize once more the truth of St. Paul's words that God chooses the weak things of the world to confound the strong. We see it in the short account of the life and work of Jeanne Jugan¹ who was born in 1792 at Cancale, a fishing port on the Breton coast. After spending her first twenty-five years in simple homely work in her native village she went to St. Servan where she became a nurse in the Rosais hospital; but she soon left to become a servant to a pious lady who, on her death, bequeathed to Jeanne a small legacy of 600 francs. With a friend, Françoise Aubert, Jeanne rented a couple of rooms with an attic, and there in the winter of 1839 she took into her humble dwelling a poor blind and helpless woman, who had no one else to care for her. Soon other poor women were received, and more applications necessitated a larger dwelling. With the increase Jeanne found that her work was insufficient to provide all that was needed, and so she became herself a beggar, going round begging for her poor people. Other women joined her in her charitable work, and gradually, with the help of Fr. Massot and the Archbishop of Rennes the Congregation of the Little Sisters of the Poor came into being. At first vows of a private nature were taken, and Jeanne received the name of Sister Mary of the Cross. In 1842 she was elected Superior for a year, and re-elected unanimously in 1843. But fifteen days later she was suddenly deposed from office, and her

¹ *Jeanne Jugan* (Sister Mary of the Cross). By Chanoine A. Hellen. Translated by Rev. Louis Herlihy. Pp. 176. (London: Sands & Co. Price 1s. 6d.)

place
This
virtue
zeal
obliv
In spi
diffic
rapid
to En
center
celebr
more
over
self-sa
aged p
with t
writte
timely
her C
the fa
St.
St. Pa
togeth
saint,
lated
C.M.,
Paul.
with
critici
the Sa
time a
was n
Mayn
Paul,¹
only,
but ra
keepin
ledges
escape
and w

place was given to another with the title of Superior General. This strange procedure served only to bring out the heroic virtue of Jeanne ; she worked on with the simplicity and zeal so characteristic of her, quite content to sink into that oblivion to which others seemed to wish to relegate her. In spite of this it was to Jeanne that people turned in the difficulties of new foundations. Foundations followed rapidly in many towns of France ; the work spread abroad, to England first, and then to other countries. When the centenary of the Foundation of the Congregation was celebrated in the year 1939, the Congregation numbered more than 6000 Little Sisters with some 307 houses spread over the five continents of the world. The wonderful self-sacrificing work of the Little Sisters in their care of the aged poor is well known to Catholics, but we are less familiar with the life of their humble Foundress. This little book, written by the Vice-Postulator of her cause, is therefore timely. It sketches briefly the history of the Foundress and her Congregation in a simple and direct manner, leaving the facts to speak for themselves.

St. Vincent de Paul is another example of the truth of St. Paul's words. Père Coste, a Vincentian, has gathered together in fourteen volumes all the materials about this saint, and has written a large life of him which was translated into English a few years ago by Fr. Joseph Leonard, C.M., under the title *The Life and Labours of St. Vincent de Paul*. This monumental work in three volumes, written with scrupulous adherence to the principles of historical criticism, will long remain the source for our knowledge of the Saint ; but since comparatively few people have the time and opportunity to peruse so large a biography, there was need for an up-to-date but smaller life. Theodore Maynard in his *Apostle of Charity : The Life of St. Vincent de Paul*,¹ has supplied this need to some extent—to some extent only, because his purpose is not to study Vincent's sanctity, but rather to show Vincent in action, at the same time keeping close to ascertained historical facts. He acknowledges that in so doing the saint may have to some extent escaped in the process. Those who endorse this self-criticism and would like to have seen more stress laid on the inner

¹ Pp. 319. George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. Price 7s. 6d.

life of the saint will nevertheless acknowledge that the writer has succeeded in presenting us with a very vivid picture of the times of St. Vincent, of the France of Richlieu and Mazarin, with its juxtaposition of so much wealth and luxury with degradation and poverty ; of so much worldliness and sin with so much genuine piety and deep mysticism. The writer's achievement is none the less appreciable because he dispels some of the legends that had gradually accumulated around Vincent's name.

Vincent's charitable works were multifarious and on a large scale ; they were called forth by the circumstances in which he found himself. Born in the little village of Pouy in Gascony in 1581, of humble peasant origin, he received as good an education as his father could manage to procure for him, and was trained for the priesthood. After his ordination, while travelling by sea from Marseilles to Narbonne, he was captured by Barbary pirates and sold as a slave ; two years later he escaped back to France and became parish priest of Clichy, one of the poorest suburbs of Paris : but not for long, for the famous Père de Bérulle obtained for him the appointment as chaplain to the de Gondi family. "When Pierre Bérulle induced—we might say, practically ordered—Vincent de Paul to become chaplain to the Gondis he showed what amounted to genius. For though the opportunities provided by such a position only manifested themselves slowly and over a period of years, he had put Vincent in the way of fulfilling his vocation." There in the de Gondi household he was tutor to the two sons, one of whom became the none too edifying Cardinal de Retz. After four years Vincent fled and went to Châtillon-les-Dombes where quite by chance he laid the foundation of the Confraternity of the Ladies of Charity. One day from the pulpit he commended a poor family of the parish to the sympathy of the congregation. Such was the effect of his words that in the afternoon when he went to visit the family he found streams of people going to take them food and other comforts. He saw clearly that such charity needed to be organized, and set to work to do so, thus establishing the confraternity of the Ladies of Charity. His return later to the de Gondi family gave him opportunity of devoting himself to the betterment of the appalling

condi
the c
Cha
rais
religi
in th
congr
partic
himse
priest
begin
as th
which

Th
the s
retrea
for th
the p
devas
ables.
out a
aid o
but v
There
wome
were
been
helpe
with
as th
Vince
dore
credi
Missi
Mada
woma
of Cl
most
But i
work
train

condition of the galley slaves, and to preaching missions on the de Gondi estates and organizing confraternities of Charity there also. Mme. de Gondi and her husband raised forty-five thousand livres for Vincent to finance a religious community which would devote itself to missions in the neglected country districts ; but he could find no congregation which considered such work to fall within its particular province. Vincent undertook the responsibility himself and proceeded to enlist the services of individual priests who would help him in the work. This was the beginning of the Congregation of the Mission, or Lazarists as the priests were called, after the college of St. Lazare which was given to them.

There seemed to be no end to the works of mercy which the saint set afoot—conferences for the clergy, spiritual retreats, seminaries for the training of priests, institutions for the rescue and education of foundlings, for the relief of the poverty and sufferings caused in the provinces by the devastation of the Thirty Years' War, a hospital for incurables. It would have been impossible for Vincent to carry out all these projects had he not been able to call on the aid of rich people, of whom there seemed to be no lack, but who needed encouragement to open their purses. There were some very generous women among them, women who, though capable of real spiritual greatness, were not without their foibles, which at times must have been a great trial to the saint. Foremost among Vincent's helpers was unquestionably St. Louise de Marillac, who with him founded the Daughters of Charity, now known as the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. She was Vincent's right hand in so many of his charities, that Theodore Maynard writes : "The Countess de Joigny has the credit of suggesting the founding of the Congregation of the Mission and of providing it with its first endowment. Madame de Goussault was the devoted and pertinacious woman who brought about the establishment of the Ladies of Charity. The Duchesse d'Aiguillon was, perhaps, the most generous of many generous benefactors of the poor. But it was Louise who was the balance-wheel even of the work done at the Hôtel-Dieu, and it was she who found and trained the first Daughters of Charity. The last work

alone would be more than sufficient to cover her with glory ; but there was no Confraternity in city or country which she did not visit, correct and inspire, no charitable enterprise undertaken by Vincent de Paul in which she was not constantly consulted."

Professor Murphy of Cork University, in *The Spirit of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul*¹ examines the spiritual foundations of the Conferences of the Society in order to find out what part they may be expected to play in the modern struggle of youth for the Faith, for it was for the preservation of the Faith of young men that Frederick Ozanam founded the Society. The book is admirably suited to revive or to keep alive the true spiritual nature of the Conferences which are established in so many of our parishes.

*God Who Giveth Joy*² is a compilation of short passages from the Old and New Testaments which show forth the loveliness of God. They are grouped under ten headings showing the God of joy, of peace, of light, of mercy and so forth. Though this little book lays no claim to scholarship, it is a useful collection of God's thoughts which should be helpful for mental prayer, especially for those souls who do not need a great amount of matter for their meditation.

Another book on prayer is *Conversation With God*.³ Fr. Thorold, in his introduction, writes that he wishes to give souls some help to counteract that restlessness which is the lot of mankind here below : that the cure for such restlessness lies in the art of speaking and listening to God, particularly the latter, and this is prayer. The book is not intended to be a treatise on prayer, but "to provide simple nourishment for countless numbers who in these times of acute anxiety *genuinely* wish to place their whole trust in their heavenly Father and yet who experience a sense of unreality in His Paternal Providence when faced with the chaotic pattern of events which have robbed the most humdrum life of all normality". The reader is taught to centre his

¹ Pp. 208. Cork University Press : London : Longmans Green & Co. Price 5s.

² By a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus. Pp. 62. (London : Sands & Co. Price 1s. 6d.)

³ By Rev. Anthony Thorold. Pp. 95. (London : Sheed & Ward. Price 3s. 6d.)

whol
the S
and
sequ
impr
expla
linge
some
easily
A
Edou
us am
in 19
six y
amon
mind
beau
whic
over
Etrép
ment
more
petua
influe
religi
T
days
based
day o
provi
rosary
ing a
in thi
to yo
munic

¹ M.
Gay.
² R.
(Paris

whole life in the Mass because it is from the Sacrifice and the Sacrament of the Altar that we draw the individual and organic support which we need. The book is a fitting sequel to the writer's former work on the Mass. What impresses one is the simple way in which deep truths are explained, and this very simplicity makes one want to linger meditatively over one's reading, for fear of missing some of the hidden treasures which might otherwise be easily overlooked.

Among the French books that have come to us, Fr. Edouard Coutan of the Grand Séminaire of Rouen gives us an attractive life of his youngest sister, Sabina,¹ who died in 1933 at the age of twenty-nine, after spending her last six years as a Dominican Sister. The first part shows her among her family and friends, a young girl of thoughtful mind, of ardent convictions, with a deep appreciation of beauty, with intellectual and artistic interests, and a nature which by its affection and sympathy gained deep influence over her friends. She joined the Dominican Sisters at Etrépagny and in her new life gave herself up to total detachment from creatures in order to serve and love them still more in God. Her brother writes this biography to perpetuate the loving memory of her virtue and of her radiating influence among her friends in the world and her sisters in religion.

The Abbé J. Raimond has published in book form a three days' retreat for the Solemn First Communion Day.² It is based on the three theological virtues, to each of which one day of the retreat is devoted. For each day, too, the author provides attractive meditations on the mysteries of the rosary. We have not the custom in this country of celebrating a Solemn First Communion Day, but priests may find in this retreat useful matter for their talks and instructions to young people who have already made their First Communion.

LAURENCE P. EMERY.

¹ *Ma Soeur Sabine*. By Abbé Ed. Coutan. Pp. 259. (Paris: Bloud et Gay. Price 20.70 francs.)

² *Retraite Théologique et Évangélique de Communion Solennelle*. Pp. 203. (Paris: Téqui. Price 12 francs.)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

EASTER COMMUNION IN PARISH CHURCH

What right, if any, has a parish priest to insist that his parishioners should either communicate at Easter in the parish church or inform him if they have made their Easter Communion elsewhere? Our current *Ordo Administrandi* directs the priest to send non-parishioners to their own parish priest for Holy Communion on Easter Sunday; is this an obligation? (W. V.)

REPLY

Canon 859 §3. *Suadendum fidelibus ut huic praecepto satisfaciant in sua quisque paroecia; et qui in aliena paroecia satisfecerint, curent proprium parochum de adimpleto praecepto certiores facere.*

The matter will best be understood by considering separately (i) the duty of communicating at Easter in the parish church; (ii) the duty of informing the parish priest; (iii) the rubric in our *Ordo Administrandi*.

(i) There is no longer any law requiring the faithful to communicate at Easter at the hands of their own parish priest, and even when the law existed grave inconvenience excused one, of course, from its observance. The obligation, which used to be quite strict, has gradually become relaxed, so that what was once a law is now a counsel—"suadendum est fidelibus"; good Catholics anxious to obey the guidance of the Church in everything will gladly respond. The canon clearly refers to the parish not to the parish church, it being considered, no doubt, that the purpose of the law is thereby secured, and that the parish priest, as well as the faithful in general, can easily discover who have made their Easter duties if Communion is received publicly within the parish. As a pendant to the modern relaxation of the older law, we find the Holy See deciding in 1912 that the prohibition against distribution of Holy Communion on Easter Sunday in the non-parochial churches of regulars is no longer in force.¹

¹ S.C.C., 28 November, 1912; *Fontes*, n. 4363.

(ii) There are canonists of repute¹ who think that it is also merely a counsel to inform the parish priest when the Easter Communion has been made outside the parish. Others hold that it is a precept, though clearly not binding *sub gravi*,² and this seems to us the correct interpretation, since the canon does not use the word "suadendum" but "curent", a word which in other canons certainly means much more than a counsel. A parish priest is, therefore, well within his rights in telling the people that he should be informed if any of them make their Easter duties outside the parish.

(iii) *Ordo Administrandi* (1915) Tit. iv, cap. iii, n. 3 : Dabit quoque operam Parochus, quoad eius fieri potest, ut in ipso die sanctissimo Paschae communicent (parochiani) ; quo die ipse per se, nisi legitime impediatur, parochiae suae fidelibus Sacramentum ministrabit. Alienae vero parochiae fideles ad proprium Parochum remittet, praeter peregrinos et advenas, et qui certum domicilium non habent, quibus ipse sacram praebabit communionem, si ad illam accesserint rite parati : vel ubi est ea consuetudo, eos ad cathedralis Ecclesiae Parochum remittet.

This familiar book can scarcely be called current since it is out of print. We think that the text dates from times when the old law was in full possession and that it will, no doubt, be modified when a new edition appears. In the meantime the common law of the Code must take precedence over the rubrics of local rituals which are at variance with it. As we have shown above, the faithful break no law in communicating outside their parishes at Easter, nor would the parish priest be justified in refusing Easter Communion to those who belong to another parish.

E. J. M.

RELIGIOUS PROFESSION

Being asked to officiate at a profession of sisters with simple vows, I found that their custom was to say the formula

¹ Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, n. 475. 5 ; Wouters, *Theologia Moralis*, I. n. 1112.

² Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, II, n. 128 ; Claeys-Bouuaert, *Manuale Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 114.

of profession singly before the priest holding the Blessed Sacrament, which was received by the sister after pronouncing the words. The priest then passed to the next when the rite was repeated. Is this procedure liturgically in order? (W. P.)

REPLY

Canon 576 §1. In emittenda professione religiosa servetur praescriptus in constitutionibus ritus.

The many formulas and ceremonies connected with religious profession may be reduced to three categories. (a) *Professio in manus*. The novice kneels before the superior, and with her joined hands enclosed in the hands of the superior pronounces the formula of profession. This rite is considered to have originated in France at the beginning of the twelfth century under the influence of the idea of vassalage. It is employed in many modern Institutes, and though usually taking place in the chapel, could be carried out in the Chapter. (b) *Professio super altare* is of Benedictine origin, and is in use amongst some Institutes of Canons Regular. At the Offertory the novice, after pronouncing the appropriate formula, signs the document on the altar and leaves it upon the corporal.¹ (c) *Professio super hostiam* or *intra Missam*. This is the custom in the Society of Jesus and, we believe, the commonest method in use today amongst religious Institutes of women; it was employed by certain medieval military orders.

Not only is it perfectly correct but it is explicitly approved by the Congregation of Rites for all professions "intra Missam". This approval, dated 5 June, 1896, referred to the rite as described in a decree 14-27 August, 1894² which is as follows: "Celebrans profitentium vota excepturus, sumpto Sanctissimo Eucharistiae Sacramento, absoluta Confessione ac verbis quae ante fidelium Communionem dici solent, Sacram Hostiam manu tenens, ad profitentes sese convertet: hi vero singuli, alta voce, professionem suam legent, ac postquam quisquis legerit, statim SSmum Eucharistiae Sacramentum sumet." For *renovation*

¹ Cervia, *De Professione Religiosa*, p. 141.

² N. 3912 and 3837.

of vows a slightly modified procedure is described: the priest turns to the altar instead of facing those renewing their profession.

So far as we are aware, this approval, dating from 1896, is still in force for all professions "intra missam". In any case, the celebrant is acting quite correctly by following the rubrics or description set out in the approved Constitutions of each Religious Institute.

E. J. M.

MARRIAGE DISPENSATION IN CANON 1045 §3

Does the clause "omnia parata etc." mean that the priest may use his powers of dispensation only when the impediment is discovered after the parties have arrived in the church? (X.)

REPLY

Canon 1045 §3. In iisdem rerum adiunctis (i.e. quoties impedimentum detegatur, cum iam omnia sunt parata ad nuptias, nec matrimonium, sine gravis mali periculo differri possit usque dum . . . dispensatio obtineatur) eadem facultate gaudeant omnes de quibus in can. 1044 (i.e. tum parochus, tum sacerdos qui matrimonio ad normam can. 1098, n. 2, assistit, tum confessarius, sed hic pro foro interno in actu sacramentalis confessionis tantum) sed solum pro casibus occultis in quibus ne loci quidem Ordinarius adiri possit, vel nonnisi cum periculo violationis secreti.

We assume that all the other conditions are verified for the valid and lawful grant of a dispensation by a priest, as formulated in Canons 1043-1047 and in the decisions given on dubious points by the Code Commission. It is a vast subject, as a matter of fact, and most of us, even if we know these canons by heart, hope that the occasion for applying them may never come our way.

The kind of urgency which arises when an impediment is not discovered until everything is ready for the marriage is verified when the discovery takes place after the parties have arrived at the church, but it is not restricted to these circumstances. All cases are included in which there is

danger, even a probable danger, of people suffering grave injury through postponing an arranged marriage for the time required in seeking a dispensation through the usual channels. The usual way of obtaining dispensations from the Ordinary is by letter, not by telephone or telegram, nor by attending personally upon the Ordinary. Priests may use these extraordinary methods, if it can be done without endangering a person's good name, and most priests would prefer to do so, particularly if they are not feeling too sure about their knowledge of the law in these canons; but there is no obligation. Normally a transaction by letter within a diocese takes about two days, but it might take a week or more under war conditions.

The law is explained in a Rota judgement of 25 May, 1925¹, in which the parties unsuccessfully sought a decree of nullity on the grounds that a dispensation from affinity was invalidly given by the Ordinary; its application to a dispensation given by a priest in similar circumstances is evident. "Verba autem 'cum omnia parata sunt ad nuptias' bifariam intelligi possunt; vel coarctantur nimirum ad nuptias *hic et nunc*, paucas post horas, celebrandas, et hic sensus nullam latitudinem intervalli moraliter patitur; vel dilatantur ad nuptias *post aliquod intervallum temporis* celebrandas, v.g. post duos, post viginti dies, quod utique variari potest pro circumstantiis. Sed ex contextu liquet intervallum non fixum esse debere sed variabile in casu; nam celebrandae nuptiae supponuntur absque possibilitate adeundi S. Sedem pro dispensatione obtinenda, quae possibilitas exclusis telegrapho et telephono diversimode profecto dimitienda est pro finitimis Urbi et pro dissitis Orbis plagis; quin etiam ex §3 eiusdem canonis possibilitas longe diverse dimetienda opponitur iisdem verbis 'cum omnia parata sunt ad nuptias' nempe adeundi Ordinarium. Fieri itaque non potest quod in novo iure locutio illa servet univocum inflexibilemque valorem quem habet in sacris Litteris (Matt. xxii, 4). . . . Quod denique spectat *probabile* periculum gravis mali cum dilatazione coniuncti, res, ut patet, remittitur aestimanda arbitrio Ordinarii, dummodo ratione regatur, quod praesumitur. Non sufficit quidem mera possibilitas, sed nec requiritur

¹ *Decisiones*, XVII, 1925, p. 199, *Coram Manucci*.

certitudo futuri periculi ; agitur enim de sola praevisione, nam probabile dicitur periculum si iuxta humanam praevisionem imminere timetur”.

The law, therefore, is not to be restricted to the case where the wedding party has arrived at the church, and cannot be dismissed without causing grave vexation to everyone. It includes other contingencies occurring on the eve of the marriage.

E. J. M.

HOUSEKEEPERS

Are there any regulations about the age and other qualities of housekeepers in presbyteries ? (H.)

REPLY

Canon 133 §2 : Eisdem (clericis) licet cum illis tantum mulieribus cohabitare in quibus naturale foedus nihil mali permittit suspicari, quales sunt mater, soror, amita et huiusmodi, aut a quibus spectata morum honestas, cum provectiore aetate coniuncta, omnem suspicionem amoveat.

§3. Iudicium an retinere vel frequentare mulieres, etiam illas in quas communiter suspicio non cadit, in peculiari aliquo casu scandalo esse possit aut incontinentiae afferre periculum, ad Ordinarium loci pertinet, cuius est clericos ab hac retentione vel frequentatione prohibere.

The common law of Canon 133 does not define the age meant by “aetas provector”. Some, relying on the “aetas superadulta”, one of the canonical causes in petitioning for dispensation from impediments, suggest that 24 might be taken as a suitable age.¹ Usually the canonists reckon that 40, more or less, is meant in this context.²

Quite often the common law is made more definite by local legislation. *Westminster Provincial Council, IV, Decretum xi*, quoting the first Council, is content to speak in general

¹ Augustine, *Commentary*, Vol. I, p. 81.

² Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum*, II, n. III ; Claeys-Bouuaert, *Manuale*, I, n. 289.

terms and thus describes the qualities which are to be desired: "Famulae autem quae presbyteris serviunt sint provectionis aetatis, modestia, prudentia vitaeque illibatae experimento probatae, ut canonum sanctiones servantur. Ideoque summopere caveant sacerdotes a quibusdam foeminis, quae dominando, pauperes Christi despiciendo, discordias susurribus seminando, vere fiunt missionis pestes". Many priests would agree that there are persons circulating in this country as priests' housekeepers who are "pests" in the sense of this conciliar text, although undoubtedly of canonical age.

Diocesan laws occasionally determine the age exactly, in which case the law is binding upon all priests serving that diocese. Thus Lancaster, *Synod I*, (1935) n. 18: "The senior servant or housekeeper of a priest should ordinarily be not less than 40 years of age. Si quae talem aetatem non habeat, licentia episcopi obtineri debet, antequam admitatur". The *Synodal Decrees* of Middlesbrough (1933) n. 16, have an exactly similar provision. The Malines *Diocesan Statutes* (1924) n. 53, 2, decide the age as 30, except for certain near relatives.

If there is no local legislation on the point, we think the age of 30, which is the lowest we have discovered in any legal text, may be taken as a safe rule. But there is no obligation to accept it; "aetas provectionis"—the canonical age—is only one of the qualifications required by the law, and if it is not settled by local enactment the reason is that the legislator has seen fit to leave a decision to the good sense of the clergy, who might say with St. Paul in I Cor. ix, 5: "Have we not power to carry about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?"

E. J. M.

CURATE AND MARRIAGE IMPEDIMENT

A parish priest may, in certain contingencies, dispense from occult impediments, when there is not time to have recourse to the Ordinary. Is it a correct interpretation of the law that not only the parish priest may dispense, as Canon 1045 §3 compared with Canon 1044 expressly states, but

also the curate or any priest who enjoys delegation for marriages? (X.)

REPLY

Canon 1045 §3, declaring that in certain contingencies an occult impediment may be dispensed when it is not discovered until everything is prepared for marriage, states that the power of dispensing is enjoyed by the persons mentioned in Canon 1044, namely, (a) the parish priest; (b) the priest who may be present at marriages contracted before two witnesses according to the law of Canon 1098, n. 2; (c) the confessor for the internal sacramental forum only. The question raised by our correspondent is whether in category (a) is included not only the parish priest but any priest who is validly and lawfully delegated to assist at marriages.

From Canon 1044 any priest may dispense *qua* confessor, for the internal forum only and in the act of sacramental confession. It must also be said that any delegated priest would act wisely in referring the matter to the parochus if he can easily be reached, before using the powers contained in Canon 1045 §3, since it is a matter of unusual complexity and involves a correct registration of the dispensation conceded. A further reason why he should, if possible, refer the case to the parish priest is that a certain answer to the above question cannot be given. It is a *dubium iuris*, and the prudent solution is to secure the dispensation from one who can give it with certainty.

Some canonists are of the opinion that a priest delegated for marriages is not included under the designation "parochus" in this canon, unless the dispensing power is also delegated. Thus, De Becker: "Cum parochus ordinariam habeat potestatem, eam delegare valet suis vice-parochis. At plane est abstinendum ab absurda et singulari opinione quod parochus delegans suum vicarium pro assistendo matrimonio, eo ipso censeatur ei concessisse potestatem dispensandi in casibus quibus potest".¹ Wernz-Vidal also inclines to this view;² likewise Vermeersch-Creusen.³

¹ *De Matrimonio*, p. 175.

² *Jus Canonicum*, V, n. 425, note 90.

³ *Epitome*, II, n. 311.

When a canonist describes the view he is rejecting as "absurd", one hesitates to give any support to the absurdity. Nevertheless, we agree with those canonists who concede to any priest validly assisting at a marriage the powers of dispensation which the canons expressly grant to a "parochus". The reasons for this view are concisely expressed by Chelodi: "Quid vero de sacerdote e.g. de vicario cooperatore ad assistendum matrimonio legitime delegato? Sunt qui tenent eum potestate dispensandi esse destitutum nisi parochus eam ipsi delegaverit. Alii censent applicandum in tali casu Can. 200 §1 ita ut delegatio ad assistendum secum ferat potestatem dispensandi. Alii tandem putant nomine parochi venire etiam sacerdotem delegatum cum Codex omnes enumerare debeat sacerdotes qui hic intervenire possunt. Et recte quidem cum secus sacerdos ad assistendum delegatus minore facultate polleret quam quilibet sacerdos matrimonio mere assistens ad normam Can. 1098 n.2."¹ This is also the opinion of authorities such as De Smet, *Praxis Matrimonialis*, 1939, n. 29; and Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, 1939, n. 237 c.

It might well happen that, if the point is ever decided by the Codex Commission, the solution will be that, just as an Ordinary may dispense when the Holy See cannot be reached, and a parish priest when the Ordinary cannot be reached, so likewise a delegated priest may use the powers of Canon 1435 only when the parish priest cannot be consulted. This is what we have suggested, as a measure of prudence, in para. 2 above; but it is not the law, and most of the writers who incline to the stricter view admit that the opposite opinion is solidly probable.²

E. J. M.

BURIAL IN NON-CATHOLIC CEMETERIES

Amongst the cases proposed for discussion at a recent conference was one on ecclesiastical burial. The Catholic wife of a mixed marriage died and her husband insisted

¹ *Ius Matrimoniale*, n. 44.

² Cf. W. Dunne, *CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1940, pp. 306-317 for a full discussion of Canons 1043-1045.

on her being interred in the cemetery attached to the local Anglican church. The parish priest protested in vain, and then, bowing to the inevitable, performed the funeral rites at the grave. The proponent, quoting a reply of the Holy Office from *THE CLERGY REVIEW* (Feb. 1938, p. 172), held that the priest was not justified in his action. Many of the clergy agreed; others, however, held that this was a private reply, never officially published and so not binding in England. Some thought that the priest would be justified in reciting the funeral prayers at home, but not in the cemetery, except, perhaps, to avoid the possibility of the non-Catholic minister attending. Which of these views is correct? Has custom any force in the case? (Grave Digger.)

REPLY

The reply of the Holy Office, 13 February, 1936, mentioned in this Review, 1938, Vol. XIV, p. 172, and 1938, Vol. XV, p. 165, is a private one, but the point is not strictly relevant, in our view, since the authentic interpretation of the law contained in this reply is "declaratory" and, from canon 17 §2, needs no promulgation.

It declared that family affection was not a sufficient reason justifying the burial of a Catholic in a non-Catholic cemetery. The circumstances above narrated are not merely family affection, but a resolute refusal on the part of the husband to permit his wife to be buried according to the normal law of the Church, as contained in Canon 1205 §1: "*Cadavera fidelium sepelienda sunt in coemeterio quod, secundum ritus in probatis liturgicis libris traditos, sit benedictum, sive solemniter sive simpliciter benedictione ab iis data de quibus in cann. 1155, 1156.*" The situation is that, morally speaking, no blessed cemetery is available, and the official commentator on the rescript remarks: "*Unica exceptio in canone 1206 §3 habetur quando propter leges iniquas catholici sepelire debent in coemeteriis civilibus in quibus nullum spatium catholicis est reservatum et benedictum. In hoc casu singuli tumuli toties quoties benedici possunt et debent et sepultura ritu catholico et per ministrum catholicum fit.*" The above case can be brought within

this commentary, inasmuch as our civil laws permit the executor to dispose of the body as he sees fit, unless the last will of the deceased contains other directions.

In places which have no Catholic cemetery, and no portion in a municipal one, a priest has no choice but to bury the dead in the ground attached to the Protestant church. In these exceptional contingencies custom, no doubt, establishes the lawfulness of the rite being performed by a priest at the grave.

The objection to the practice is manifest, but often unavoidable. As we stated in answering a similar query in this Review, 1938, Vol. XV, p. 166, a priest should refer the matter to the Ordinary if there is any doubt in his mind concerning his obligations. Without in any way suggesting what the Ordinary's decision should be, we think that the parish priest acted correctly in the above case, not solely in order to prevent the attendance of a non-Catholic minister, but simply to carry out the Catholic rite as far as the circumstances allowed.

E. J. M.

BURIAL OF NON-CATHOLICS

The interesting reply on "Ecclesiastical Burial" in the June issue of THE CLERGY REVIEW appears to involve a complete *bouleversement* of cherished ideas and traditional practice. It follows from it that ecclesiastical burial can be given to a large number of baptized non-Catholics. Some of us have held that the law of Canon 1206 §1 implies that the "propria coemeteria" which the Church has a right to possess, must be for those who are in communion with the Church. The notorious apostates, etc., mentioned in Canon 1240 would be Catholics who became excommunicated. We have known cases exactly similar to that in the Review in which the Ordinary has refused permission for ecclesiastical burial, to the satisfaction of the clergy, who felt that such a permission, especially outside the case of mixed marriages, would be a source of scandal. One can readily imagine the "admiratio" which would arise if the priest admitted to Christian burial an adult who never

entered
Sacra
kindly
strict
are e
Requ

If
Vol.
answe
previ
burial
above
who v
consi
Canon
provi
"C

scand
the p
may
"not
precis
"not
with

H
decid
that
Every
our p
not c
do so

T
funer
think
funer

1 "1

entered a Catholic place of worship and never received a Sacrament through the ministry of a priest. Would you kindly say whether we may still continue to follow this stricter ruling and also whether non-Catholics in such cases are entitled to be buried with full funeral rites, including a Requiem Mass in accordance with Canon 1204? (Chaplain.)

REPLY

If the reader will kindly refer to this Review, 1940, Vol. XVIII, p. 546, it will be found, we think, that the answer to the above query is substantially contained in our previous reply which recorded the view that "ecclesiastical burial is not forbidden in the circumstances as narrated above (burial of the non-Catholic party to a mixed marriage who was not a notorious heretic, etc.); there is, at least, a considerable element of doubt, and it is permitted from Canon 1240 §2, if the Ordinary cannot be reached, and provided there is no scandal".¹

"Chaplain" suggests that there is the possibility of scandal in such cases; if this is so, and it cannot be removed, the practice is unlawful. It must be noted that any Christian may be excommunicated without it necessarily being "notorious", and the liberal view which we favoured rests precisely on the fact that certain non-Catholics are not "notorious" heretics, schismatics, etc., taken in conjunction with their condition of being married to a Catholic.

He mentions, in addition, that a local Ordinary has decided against the practice, his reasons being, no doubt, that there is always scandal which cannot be removed. Everything is completely in order, and in harmony with our previous reply. The clergy subject to that Ordinary not only *may* follow his directions but they are bound to do so.

The question of including a Requiem Mass in the funeral obsequies was not previously touched upon. We think that it is forbidden from Canon 2262 §2, 2, since a funeral Mass *praesente cadavere* is obviously public.

¹ "1239" in the previous reply is an error for "1240".

We do not agree with our correspondent that there are a large number of non-Catholics who could rightly be buried with Catholic ceremonial exclusive of the Requiem Mass. The number is restricted to those who are not notorious heretics, schismatics, etc., and with regard to whom some justifying reason exists, such as marriage to a Catholic, together with the removal of scandal.

E. J. M.

SEA VOYAGERS' FACULTIES

Can it be safely held that the sea-journey from England to Ireland, e.g. from Liverpool or Holyhead to Dublin, constitutes an "iter maritimum" for the purpose of receiving confessional faculties *a iure* in the sense of Canon 883? (Peregrinus.)

REPLY

This interpretation can be safely held since the law does not determine the length of the voyage. From Canon 200 §1, the faculty is of strict interpretation and cannot, therefore, be obtained by those who are in a boat on the sea for some purpose other than making a journey, e.g. fishing, even though they spend several hours or even days in this pursuit. Thus Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, II, n. 153: "Maritimum iter dicitur plus quam maritimam quamdam ambulationem qua, recreationis vel piscationis causa, quispiam per aliquot horas a portu solvit." Nor can it apply, with certainty, to a journey across the mouth of a river: "An *mare* late intelligendum sit etiam de canalibus marinis vel de ore fluminum, v.g. canal de Corinthe, canal de Suez, Garonne depuis Bordeaux, Escant depuis Anvers, non constat."¹ We think that, for appropriate reasons, Canon 209 could be used in order to obtain jurisdiction in all these doubtful cases.

But there is no doubt at all concerning the sea voyage between England and Ireland. The best and fullest commentary on this useful canon is that given by Fr. Berutti in

¹ Chretien, *De Poenitentia*, p. 363.

Jus Pontificium, 1934, Vol. XIV, pp. 61-66, in the course of which the point raised is defined as follows: "Facultates de quibus in can. 883 . . . omnibus et singulis sacerdotibus competunt qui qualibet ex causa (etiam solummodo ad animi solatium et forte absque licentia Superioris) iter maritimum reapse perficiant: dummodo utique aliqua jurisdictione audiendarum confessionum iidem actu potiantur, ad normam in can. 883 §1 praestitutam. Iter maritimum perficere ii dici non possunt, qui diutius quoque—forte etiam per unum vel plures integros dies—in mari vagantur, quin tamen proprie ex uno ad alium terminum terrestrem praefinitum se transferant per mare, saltem ad brevissimum tempus: minime enim excluditur iter, quod arripiatur cum intentione statim redeundi ad eundem locum ex quo discessus fit."

As supporting the above interpretation, it will be found that the Holy See, in granting special faculties to priest pilgrims going to Lourdes or Loretto, takes for granted the application of Canon 883, no matter how short the sea journey may be, and extends the faculties beyond the limits of the canon.

E. J. M.

UNLAWFUL BAPTISMAL SPONSOR

Titius, a priest, is administering baptism. He notices as godmother a young woman who has been living in sin for some time and has not made her Easter duty. He refuses to continue with the baptism until another godmother is found. Is he justified in his action? (Co-operator.)

REPLY

Canon 765: "Ut quis sit patrinus, oportet: . . . 2. Ad nullam pertineat haereticam vel schismaticam sectam, nec sententia condemnatoria vel declaratoria sit excommunicatus aut infamis infamia iuris aut exclusus ab actibus legitimis. . . ."

Canon 766: "Ut autem quis licite patrinus admittatur,

oportet . . . 2. Non sit propter notorium delictum excommunicatus vel exclusus ab actibus legitimis vel infamis infamia iuris, quin tamen sententia intercesserit, nec sit interdictus aut alias publice criminosus vel infamis infamia facti. . . ."

"Living in sin" suggests a *prima facie* case that the proposed sponsor is either unable, from Canon 765, or unacceptable, from Canon 766, for the office of sponsor. It will be necessary to determine the phrase "living in sin" more accurately.

Thus *infamia iuris* accompanies bigamy (Canon 2356) and conviction of certain gross sexual crimes (Canon 2357). *Exclusion from lawful acts*, amongst which is the office of sponsor, follows upon public adultery or concubinage (Canon 2357 §2) and mixed marriage without a dispensation (Canon 2375).

A person who is otherwise suitable, but who has not observed the Paschal precept, cannot for that neglect alone be rejected from the office of baptismal sponsor. It is, however, essential from Canon 765.4 for the sponsor to be chosen by the parents or guardians of the child; a priest may lawfully use his influence to persuade the parents or guardians to choose a sponsor who has observed the precept.

Many teach that, on the score of avoiding scandal, it is lawful to reject a sponsor who has neglected the Paschal precept, or who has in some other way not specified in the law given grave offence.¹ In such cases it will be necessary to establish that the offence is publicly known and that the guilty person cannot be admitted as sponsor without causing scandal.

Unless the priest can rely on the parties bringing the child at some other time, it is usually preferable to proceed with the baptism lacking a sponsor than to run the risk of the child not being baptized.

E. J. M.

¹ Gougnard, *Collationes Theologicae*, 1932, p. 42; Prümmer, *Theologia Moralis*, III, §146.

ROMAN DOCUMENT

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SACRAMENTIS

No. 4741/39.

ROMAE, die 22 Augusti, 1940.

Rev.me ac Exc.me Domine,

Litteras Excellentiae Tuae Rev.mae, diei 28 iulii 1939, quae de sacrilegio die 21 iunii 1939 in ecclesia paroeciali loci v. X. . . . istius dioecesis perpetrato tractant, haec S. Congregatio diligenti subiecit examini.

Agitur sane de casu valde lugendo cum profanatione SS.mae Eucharistiae gravissima, quin tamen de intentione SS.mi formaliter profanandi certo constet.

Duo iuvenes acatholici, inventis portis apertis, penetrarunt in ecclesiam et in sacristiam: explorato sacristiae suppellectili, effregerunt armarium ligneum, in quo asservabatur clavis tabernaculi; qua inventa, tabernaculum aperuerunt relictoque ciborio asportaverunt sacras hostias quarum duae repertae sunt in pavimento ecclesiae, aliae vero, circiter 23-26, partim in sepe, partim juxta viam publicam, etc.

Notandum insuper eadem die eosdem iuvenes nequam ecclesiam loci v. Z. . . ., eiusdem regionis et dioecesis, sacrilege invasisse: in quo tamen SS.mum non asservabatur.

Parochus ecclesiae, de quo in casu, culpaе negligentiae vel incuriae noxius habendus non videtur. Tabernaculum enim erat arca securitatis (safe); 'clavis tabernaculi in sacrario altera clavi clauso a sacerdote custodita fuit.'

In actis processus nihil de functionibus propitiationis refertur; quae si revera factae non sint, adhuc quamprimum cum concursu populi (v.g. triduo eucharistico, arcessito sacerdote eximiae pietatis et eloquentiae) instituantur.

Ut vero in posterum pro viribus humanis similia luctuosa facta vitentur, in ecclesia, de qua agitur, omnia accuratissime restaurentur ad normam praescriptorum canonicorum, praesertim Instructionis huius S. Congregationis: in specie clavis tabernaculi extra horas sacrarum functionum non servetur in sacristia, sed apud ipsum parochum. Non solum tabernaculum, sed etiam sacristiae armarium in quo serventur sedulo servanda, sit arca ferrea securitatis (safe).

De caetero Excellentia Tua Rev.ma curare velit ut adhuc diligentius istius dioecesis ecclesiarum securitati provideatur, eo quidem modo quo portae non apertae pateant in horis quibus fideles Sanctissimum visitantes non adsint, caeteris vero temporibus ecclesiae numquam sine ulla maneant vigilantia.

Quae dum renuntio, omni, quo par est, obsequio permaneo,

Excellentiae Tuae Rev.mae in Domino addictissimus.

F. BRACCI, Sec.

We are indebted to the proprietors of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for permission to reprint the above document, which has been received by the Ordinary of the place in which the sacrilege occurred.

To appreciate its meaning the reader is referred to THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1938, Vol. XV, p. 170, where a full account is given of the *Instruction* issued by the Holy See on Ascension Day, 1938, referred to in the penultimate paragraph of the above document. Section 10 (b) of this *Instruction* requires Ordinaries to institute a process, whenever a sacrilegious theft of the Blessed Sacrament occurs in a place within their jurisdiction, in order to discover if it was due to the negligence of the rector of the church or chapel. Detailed and rather elaborate rules and precautions are enjoined by the Holy See for the custody of the Tabernacle key, and happily in the above case the parish priest was absolved from all blame since he had observed these rules: the tabernacle was a strong safe and the key was kept in a locked place in the sacristy, as laid down in section 6 (c) of the *Instruction*.

The Sacred Congregation refers to Acts of Reparation. These were, as a matter of fact, held throughout the diocese immediately after the sacrilege had taken place; and it is some satisfaction for the local faithful to know that the outrage was not committed by Irishmen, nor was it done with the intention of profaning the Blessed Sacrament. It was an act of hooliganism on the part of a couple of English youths on a holiday visit to the country.

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

PULPITS

LITURGICAL experts are not favourably disposed towards pulpits. They regard them with suspicion as the usurpers of the ancient ambos. The authoritative sources of information are silent, and beyond a passing reference in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* there are no regulations or directions. An ancient rubric prescribes that a bishop should preach from his throne and a priest from the steps of the altar, but the ambo may be used if more convenient. Pulpits, as permanent structures independent of the ambo and the rood-loft (which was sometimes, though not generally, used for preaching by mediaeval priests), first made their appearance about the end of the thirteenth century. There can be no doubt that the preaching of the friars, which also had a marked influence on architecture, created a need for more commodious platforms and that this was supplied by the invention of free-standing pulpits. The oldest pulpit in England, a narrow wooden construction still in use, is at Mellor in Derbyshire; it dates from about the middle of the fourteenth century.

Even if pulpits have no liturgical existence they must now be regarded as established articles of equipment, and a large church would be incomplete without one.

In the absence of rules we must be guided by custom and common sense. Long observed custom prescribes that in a cathedral the pulpit should be placed on the epistle side, and on the gospel side in a parish church. The explanation is really quite simple. It is undesirable to obstruct the view of the bishop or, in a parish church, of the celebrant, and so the more suitable side for the pulpit is the one opposite the throne or the sedilia. Moreover, in theory a preacher should address his exordium to the presiding minister, and to do this he should be able to turn towards him without turning his back on the people. It is fitting also that in a parish church the pulpit should be on the side which by right belongs to the ambo. Still, there is no law about it and we are free to choose the position which we consider to be most convenient. From the point of view of the architect

the placing of a pulpit is always a difficulty : it should be an ornamental, not an obstructive, feature, and careful attention must be given to acoustic properties. Fortunately, the introduction of microphones has made it possible to dispense with those cumbersome and unsightly attachments known as sounding boards.

For the comfort of both preacher and people a pulpit should be placed as near to the chancel as possible ; for those in the front benches listening becomes a strain when the pulpit is nearly half-way down the nave, and the preacher is conscious of an awkwardness when part of his audience is behind his back. A pulpit which is massively out of proportion with the building is an eyesore, and many a beautiful little church is spoilt by the presence of one much too large, often enough the cast-off of a bigger and more fortunate neighbour. It should be remembered that our churches are not, like so many Anglican churches built in the eighteenth century, primarily preaching-halls.

Why have a pulpit at all in a small church ? It is not necessary, and for the accommodation of priests who find it too trying to preach from the steps of the altar without support, a neat wooden lectern raised on a low platform either just inside or just outside the rails should be amply sufficient. A pulpit should be fitted with a ledge to hold books, and a shaded lamp can be very useful. The monumental pulpits of the Victorian era are often fitted on the top with heavy cushions ; these are great collectors of dust.

On Sundays and greater feasts the pulpit may be draped with hangings of the colour of the day.¹ These should not be so voluminous as to conceal any valuable carving or ornamentation. A hanging all round from the top to a depth of not more than twelve inches, or a single broad strip of embroidered silk draped down the front from the middle of the book-rest, can be very effective. Some of our churches could do with more colour discreetly applied, and a colourful splash helps to enliven the liturgical feasts.

J. P. R.

¹ *Caer. Epis.* Lib. I, Cap xii, 18.

BOOK REVIEW

Pius, Pope of Charity. Preface by Most Rev. Archbishop Godfrey. (Sheed and Ward. 2s. 6d.)

IT is ungracious to criticize the attempt by any Catholic publisher to supply a convenient collection of extracts from the Pope's teaching in regard to the war, and particularly when the publishers have assembled material which deserves the widest publicity. But even in these difficult times for publishers it should surely be possible to issue a little volume, containing less than sixty pages of text, at a more popular price than half a crown. The whole volume contains less than do many of the twopenny pamphlets of the C.T.S., and one can only hope that another and a fuller selection made by the C.T.S. will make the Pope's teaching available to the widest public.

There is real need for such a compilation which will familiarize the whole public with the Pope's actual words by detaching the most vital passages from the long encyclicals and other documents in which they are to be found. The present collection is apparently translated from one made in Rome by "Vita Ecclesiae", and it contains only the pronouncements made during 1939. It includes, among other miscellaneous extracts, passages from the Pope's first broadcast to the world, from his first encyclical, and his famous allocution a year ago which outlined the five points essential for a just peace. But it lacks arrangement, and does not present the general burden of the Pope's teaching in any coherent order, and it ends unaccountably with a personal tribute to Marconi as the inventor of wireless broadcasting, which comes almost as an anticlimax in a book chiefly concerned with wider subjects.

It is necessary to search from page to page to find the passages (not all of them included here) which provide the answers to so many questions which are constantly asked concerning the Holy See and the war. It would have been easy, for instance, to show by judicious arrangement of the texts, how the Pope's teaching is directed primarily against materialism in all its forms : against the avarice which has produced class warfare no less than against the political ambitions which have produced war ; against the soulless

commercialism which has created such widespread misery and insecurity, no less than against the racial paganism which refuses to be bound by honourable treaties. And in regard to national service and patriotic duty much more could have been done to make clear the unchanging attitude of the Holy See.

One of the most remarkable extracts in this little book is from the apostolic exhortation to conscript priests and clerics in December 1939.¹ It urges the clergy to continue their apostolate while on military service and to make the utmost use of their new opportunities, while at the same time exhorting them to show an "exemplary fidelity to your new duties". This and other extracts included are by no means widely known and they give a special value to this little collection, which makes one wish all the more that it should be issued in a much cheaper format as a popular pamphlet.

D. G.

¹ The full text of the original was published in this REVIEW, Vol. XVIII, p. 354.

The volumes for 1940 CLERGY REVIEW can be bound in cloth as usual at 4s. 6d. per volume.

The numbers should be addressed to 28, Ashley Place, London, S.W.1.—[EDITOR.]

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

of
wi
so
de
he
th
th
to

Su